THE Lutheran Quarterly

ume XII FEBRUARY, 1960 Number 1

v.12
1960

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Book Editor
ARNOLD E. CARLSON
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

Circulation Manager
LOWELL J. SATRE
Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwestern Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Trinity Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume XII February, 1960 Number 1

CONTENTS

AN EVALUATION OF REINHOLD NIEBUHR'S ETHICS ..... *Karl H. Hertz* 3

JOHN STOUGH, FOUNDER OF OHIO LUTHERANISM ..... *Willard D. Allbeck* 25

THE DIARIES OF JOHN STOUGH, 1806-1807 ..... *Theodore G. Tappert* 44

EFFECTS OF MOBILITY OF POPULATION ..... *Walter Wietzke* 51

IRENAEUS AND THE VALENTINIANS ..... *Otto Reimherr* 55

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

High Church Minority Opposed in Denmark ..... *Johannes Knudsen* 60
Preaching, Psychoanalysis, and Drama in Finland ..... *Jacob W. Heikkinen* 62

CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMENT

Paradosis and Apokalupsis in I Cor. 11:23 ..... *Robert Paul Roth* 64

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Bouquet, *Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions* (W. H. K. Narum) 68
Herberg, *Four Existentialist Theologians* (P. Holmer) 69
Berthold, *The Fear of God* (A. E. Carlson) 70
Ryden, *The Story of Christian Hymnody* (G. M. Cartford) 71
Sing to the Lord (G. M. Cartford) 72
Richardson, *Introduction to New Testament Theology* (M. J. Heinecken) 73
Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* (R. M. Hals) 74
Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (P. A. Quanbeck) 75
Plass, ed., *What Luther Says: An Anthology* (R. H. Fischer) 76
Boyer, *Luther in Protestantism Today* (R. H. Fischer) 77
Herklots, *The Ten Commandments and Modern Man* (A. J. Traver) 78
Runes, *Concise Dictionary of Judaism* (R. M. Hals) 78
Bahm, *Philosophy of the Buddha* (W. H. K. Narum) 79
Ramsay, *The Christ of the Earliest Christians* (E. H. Wahlstrom) 79
Bowie, *I Believe in Jesus Christ* (W. J. Kukkonen) 80
Barth, *A Shorter Commentary on Romans* (E. H. Wahlstrom) 80
Jansen, *The Meaning of Baptism* (E. C. Fendt) 80
Deere, *The Twelve Speak* (J. P. Milton) 81
Parrot, *The Temple of Jerusalem* (R. H. Boyd) 81
———, *Samaria: Capital of the Kingdom of Israel* (R. H. Boyd) 81
———, *Babylon and the Old Testament* (R. H. Boyd) 81
Yates, *God in Us* (T. A. Kantonen) 82
Laubach, *The World Is Learning Compassion* (R. L. Esbjornson) 83
Docherty, *One Way of Living* (R. L. Esbjornson) 85
Luther's Works. Vol. 40: Church and Ministry, II (A. E. Carlson) 86
Holl, *The Cultural Significance of the Reformation* 86
Clemen, *Luthers Werke in Auswahl* (T. G. Tappert) 87
Barclay, *History of Methodist Missions,* Vol. III 87

CONTRIBUTORS

KARL H. HERTZ is professor of Sociology in Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio.

WILLARD D. ALLBECK is professor of Historical Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

WALTER WIETZKE is pastor of St. James Church (American Lutheran Church) in Detroit, Michigan.

OTTO REIMHERR is assistant professor of Philosophy and Religion in Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania.

JOHANNES KNUDSEN is professor of Church History in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois.

JACOB W. HEIKKINEN is professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

ROBERT PAUL ROTH is professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are WILLIAM H. K. NARUM, professor of Philosophy in St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.; PAUL HOLMER, professor of Philosophy in the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; GERHARD M. CARTFORD, director of Music in Bethel Lutheran Church, Minneapolis; MARTIN J. HEINECKEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; RONALD M. HALS, professor of the Old Testament in Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio; PHILIP A. QUANBECK, dean in Augsburg College, Minneapolis; ROBERT H. FISCHER, professor of Church History in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois; AMOS J. TRAVER, professor of Practical Theology in Hamma Divinity School.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

16 855

An Evaluation of Reinhold Niebuhr's Ethics

By Karl H. Hertz

THE outstanding role which Reinhold Niebuhr has played in the debates on controversial issues in social morality and politics is widely recognized. Yet since the central concern was usually the choice of particular policies, the relationship between policy and the general outline of Niebuhr's thought was often implicit rather than explicit. The recently published volume of Niebuhr's essays covering a variety of issues debated over the past three decades[1] should therefore contribute both to the clarification of ethical discourse and to the understanding of the interrelations of thought and action. For essentially it is a collection of Reinhold Niebuhr's occasional pieces, a record of positions taken in the midst of controversy. We have in these essays, consequently, an opportunity for a different kind of test of the cogency and relevance of Niebuhr's thought than the usual one; we can observe how his ideas function in the formation of policy and how well they stand up in the arena of social conflict.

Three major questions can be addressed to this book:

1. What kinds of policies flow from Niebuhr's position? Are they the unambiguous consequences of his premises? Do they hang together as a consistent whole?

2. To what kinds of audiences has Niebuhr addressed his ethical statements? To what degree is his place to be understood in terms of his relations to these audiences?

3. To what degree are there other ways of accounting for Niebuhr's position? In brief, can we see latent assumptions and non-theological components in Niebuhr's ethical discourse?

By answering these questions, we can evaluate more clearly Niebuhr's thinking and his place in American Protestantism. We may also gain some insight into the role of theology as prophetic criticism of the social order. Finally, against the background of the discussion

1 My evaluation of Niebuhr in this article is based primarily on *Love and Justice: Selections from the Shorter Writings of Reinhold Niebuhr,* edited by D. B. Robertson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957). Unless otherwise noted, all page references are to this volume.

of the above questions, we can undertake an analysis of the relationship between the structure of Niebuhr's ethics and that of Lutheran ethics.

The organization of these essays makes the above approach feasible. The first section delineates Niebuhr's theoretical position, and the following sections, containing occasional pieces from such varied periodicals as *The Christian Century, Christianity and Crisis,* and *The Nation,* spell out the specific applications. Here Niebuhr stands revealed, and the critic, possessing all the advantage of hindsight, may belabor in leisurely intellectual analysis what quite often must have come out of the anguish and the urgency of the moment.

The Structure of Niebuhr's Ethics

As the title suggests, *love* and *justice* are the key terms in Niebuhr's ethic. Love always represents the final ideal, the fulfillment of all other laws. But love can never stand alone, because "complete selflessness without an admixture of egoism" is impossible (p. 27), even for the most perfect Christian. The realization of love is neither easy nor automatic nor complete. Justice, a balancing of interests, a formal constraint of the greed for power and privilege, is the way we must seek in a world in which sin remains a reality.

In Niebuhr's thinking love is always identified with the ethic of Jesus. As such, he sees in it the basis for an ethic that is primarily personal and not social. "There is indeed," he asserts, "a very rigorous ethical ideal in the gospel of Jesus, but there is no social ethic in the ordinary sense of the word in it" (p. 30). At the same time it is absolute and pure, an ethic of perfection of the completely moral life.

In so far as Niebuhr defines the characteristics of love, he describes it as in essence disinterestedness. "The ethical ideal of Jesus was one of complete disinterestedness, religiously motivated. No one was to seek his own. . . . A special premium was placed upon actions which could not be rewarded" (p. 31).

At its best an ethic of love is too idealistic and moralistic (pp. 41-42).[2] As a means to the solution of the pressing problems of man's

2 "In a final conflict only those who have learned the grace of humility can be loving, for in a conflict love requires forgiveness, and forgiveness is possible only to those who know themselves to be sinners. Moral idealists never forgive their foes. They are too secure in their own virtue to do that. Men forgive their foes only when they feel themselves to be standing under God with them, and feel that under the divine scrutiny all 'our righteousness is as filthy rags'" (p. 44).

political existence, these ethical demands lead simply to self-deception. In its very emphasis on moral idealism the church tends "to create hypocrites who underestimate their own selfishness and the persistence of selfishness in society" (p. 42). Thus disinterest becomes ideological, i.e. an ethical stance which is both the product of a particular social context and even in its concern for the other is in fact protective of the status quo in which its advocate has his place. Its perfectionism is not its strength but its weakness. "So great is the confusion of the champions and protagonists of 'love' in politics and life about the relation of the absolute demands of God upon our conscience and the relative evil of all our actions that many of them work themselves into a perfect fury in criticizing their foes, not recognizing that the identification of our relative political and moral perspectives with the absolute will of God is sin in its quintessential form" (pp. 286-287).

At its best love is indeed capable of genuine sacrifice, characterized by the humility of the cross. At its worst, it is sentimental and irrelevant. Only when its perfect relationships are seen as a goal beyond history, as that at which justice aims for its final outcome, does it really play a relevant part in day-to-day ethical debate.[3]

The reason for the inadequacy of love as a guide for ethical conduct is found in sin. Love is the ethic of perfection, but human nature is far from perfect; it is "a realm of infinite possibilities of good and evil because of the character of human freedom. The love that is the law of its life is a boundless self-giving. The sin that corrupts its life is a boundless assertion of the self" (p. 54). Inevitably, then, man's self-interest perverts and corrupts his love and his understanding. In fact, sin can even twist love to its ends, as in the instance of philanthropy.[4]

Nor is this condition only that of some men some of the time. Sin is universal; in the radical sense of the word, it is original, part of our common humanity. "The quintessence of sin is, in short, that man 'changes the glory of the incorruptible God into the image of corruptible man.' He always usurps God's place and claims to be the final judge of human actions" (p. 48). All ethical discourse must

3 "Love must be regarded as the final flower and fruit of justice. When it is substituted for justice it degenerates into sentimentality and may become the accomplice of tyranny" (p. 283). Cf. also the paragraph beginning, "Love is the only final structure of freedom" (p. 50).

4 "Is Stewardship Ethical?" (pp. 89-94). This essay appeared in *The Christian Century*, April 30, 1930.

take account of this state of affairs; no moral decision is ever free of it. Furthermore, the situation will not change. "We believe rather that the world of nature and history is a world in which egoism, collective and individual, will never be completely overcome and in which the law of love will remain both an ideal for which men must strive and a criterion that will convict every new social structure of imperfection" (p. 257).

The result is the familiar Niebuhrian sense of ambiguity and paradox. Man must act, choose, decide—for freedom, for the kingdom of God, for all those ends for which the Gospel stands, yet his acts and decisions are always incomplete and broken ones. Discriminating judgment in the discernment of sin, especially in its ideological disguises, in its subtle deceits, is absolutely essential. And so is uncompromising realism about human nature.

How, then, if love is idealistic while man is sinful, shall a man find ways and means for meaningful ethical decisions?

Justice, the third term in Niebuhr's ethics, provides the answer. For in the midst of ambiguity and paradox, man cannot choose love's perfection but only the lesser imperfection of justice. The man who aims at freedom does so, paradoxically, by accepting a body of normative rules to guide his choices. He recognizes that "pure freedom," resting solely on the good will of individual persons, is not possible; he necessarily must choose "organized freedom" in which institutional constraints define the scope of liberty.

Considering its major place in Niebuhr's thought, a striking characteristic of his conception of justice is its lack of definition. Nor is this accidental, for according to Niebuhr justice in its essential nature is relative, flexible, and pragmatic. "There is no possibility of giving a rational definition of a just relation between man and man or nation and nation short of a complete love in which each life affirms the interests of the other. Every effort to give a definition of justice short of this perfect love invariably introduces contingent factors, conditions of time and place, into the definition" (p. 50).[5]

5 "In community building, as in other great human enterprises, the motto must be 'percept upon percept,' 'line upon line.' It is not a bad thing to spell out ultimate goals as well as immediate responsibilities. But we must be cognizant of the fact that some people have a habit of fleeing to ultimate ideals as a way of evading immediate responsibilities" (p. 217).

"We realize that the problem of social justice is a pragmatic and even a technical one. Modern capitalism breeds injustice because of the disproportions of economic power that it

Every set of judicial percepts is, after all, a human creation, a part of time and history, and therefore not only imperfect but also corrupted by sin. To define it would be to absolutize it, to run the risk of idolatry.

The closest approach to a definition is found in the idea of equilibrium. "For justice rests upon a decent equilibrium of power; and all balances of power involve tension; and tension involves covert conflict; and there will be moments in history when covert conflict becomes overt" (p. 53).

If Niebuhr leaves justice undefined, he does not leave it undescribed. More accurately, perhaps, we may say that he delineates some of the attributes of just decisions. Such decisions are always responsible actions, accepting the burden of the situation and its consequences. They are always made seriously, a term best understood by contrast, i.e., they are made with the intent of moving to a solution of a problem rather than to the enhancement of the virtues of the actor. Such decisions always demand the involvement of the actor in the situation. Involvement is the opposite of disinterestedness. Ethical decisions are forged in the heat of controversy. They take place in the arena, not in the grandstand.

The existential quality of the moral decision is apparent from this description. This is an ethic for the active Christian. At the same time, by its "unprincipled" nature, by its awareness of the ambiguities of choice and the persistence of self-interest, this is the ethic of the "uneasy conscience." For although Niebuhr's sense of justice, of responsibility, and of involvement move him to speak sharply and directly, his keen understanding of the limitations of every choice, of the personal and social perspectives from which all decisions are made, or, theoretically speaking, of his sense of sin, remind him with equal clarity that his choice is always at best "the lesser of two evils." Humility and repentance must accompany it; constant self-examination must prevent any choice from hardening into an absolute.

tolerates and upon which it is based. We expect no basic economic justice without a destruction of the present disproportion of power and we do not expect the latter without a social struggle. Once we have accepted the fact of the reality of the social struggle we do not feel that we can stop where the middle portion of the Fellowship of Reconciliation has stopped. We are unable to stop there because we can find no stable absolute in the shifting situation of the social struggle where everything must be finally decided in pragmatic terms" (p. 257).

The establishment of justice is therefore not a matter of ideal blueprints but of political organization and the development of adequate structures for the enforcement of law. Yet, to put it thus baldly is to create the impression that, at the point of policy, expediency has become the rule and the sense of religious involvement and responsibility has become secondary. It is true, of course, that in these occasional pieces the theological premises are often implicit. But they are there, particularly in the form of a sense of the limits on human possibilities and the insight into the brokenness of all historical existence. In one of his discussions of pacifism Niebuhr spells out rather clearly some of the theological dimensions of his positions, pointing to the relationship between love, the tragic character of history, and the cross.

> The premium placed by some of our liberal Protestants upon neutraliity, upon noninvolvement in war, is not merely an error in the present situation. It is a perennial source of error in judging all history. It has sought to make a success story out of the cross, and has admonished men to be resolute in sacrificing their lives and interests because in that way they would not have to sacrifice their lives and interests, for their goodness would shame their enemy into goodness so that he would cease to imperil them. They do not understand that the perfect love of Christ comes into the world, but that it does not maintain itself there; that the cross therefore stands at the edge of history and not squarely in history; that it reveals what history ought to be but not what history is or can be; and that the Christian faith has quite rightly seen in this cross a revelation of the divine and eternal as well as of the ultimate historical possibility and impossibility.
>
> Christ reveals the mercy of God, and the gospel declares that everyone is in need of that mercy, that without it we are undone. Why? Because all of us continue to be, even in our highest moral achievements, in contradiction to God and therefore require his mercy. This is to say that Christ is not our simple possibility. In one sense he is not our possibility at all but a revelation of the resources of divine mercy, which knows how to overcome the sinful contradiction of human history to its true pattern. Most of our liberal Protestantism has neatly disavowed all the profounder elements of the gospel, which reveal the tragic character of history, and has made the gospel identical with the truism that all men ought to be good and with the falsehood that goodness pays. The end of pure goodness, of perfect love, is the cross (pp. 276, 277).

The above passage underlines some of the major virtues of Niebuhr as a critic of the twentieth century social order. Unlike most prophets, past and present, and many idealists as well, including here

the vast majority of American clergymen and theological professors, perhaps even a large proportion of the active laity, Niebuhr is fully aware of the complexity of human moral situations. He does not oversimplify; he has no slogans. He knows that "good will," personal relations, and the passing of resolutions do not win the battle against the forces of wickedness, especially spiritual wickedness in high places. Men must deal with what is historically given in the situations in which they are involved. They must deal with these situations in all their dimensions, in terms of their organization and structure as well as in terms of their human actors. Justice—though never absolute—must be constructive; it must create responsible ways of dealing with situations, ways through which power can be harnessed and rules of equity established.

In all of this the first concern is to maintain a steady pressure for the achievement of the ends of the gospel, i.e. the enhancement of freedom, the growth of compassionate care for one another. This pressure is exerted flexibly, pragmatically, with one eye always on what is realistically possible. Consequently there is little concern with abstract logical consistency or with neat symmetrical institutional arrangements. The human community and its institutions are imperfect, constantly changing; their problems cannot be analyzed or solved with the neat logic of a Euclidean geometric demonstration.

Thus we see that in every application of this ethic to specific situations, "love," "sin," and "justice" form the major foci of discussion. While the application is not mechanical, for to treat this trio as principles would be to violate the character of the ethic, nevertheless almost every issue is (1) appraised in terms of the shortcomings of love as idealism or sentimentalism, then (2) analyzed in terms of its manifest or hidden elements of self-interest, and (3) brought to a conclusion by the plea for a specific position or program that will enhance justice.

While in Niebuhr's skillful hands this analysis is never mechanical or routine, it does—as does every creative contribution to human discourse—contain the elements of a formula. More dangerous, in fact, are the degree of stereotyping of thought which can take place and the stance of opposition which the critique of love requires. That is, in every Niebuhr essay there is an "enemy" or an "opponent" and almost

always his traits are recognizably the same. The human scene is always one of conflict and encounter, both on the level of the events to which the ethical discourse is directed and on the level of the ethical discussion itself. Ethical discussion is, in fact, debate; each side must be seen in the light of its combat situation, its self-interest and the ideological elements in its thought. In the context of the kinds of issues which Niebuhr discusses, he is probably more often right than wrong in his description of the human scene as one of conflict; he is perhaps equally often right in the characterization of the nature of his opponent. Still there is an inescapable element of pigeon-holing and oversimplification, a tendency to see every proponent of love as an individualist, as a sentimental advocate of an impossible idealism, a believer in "the ethic of Jesus."

What has happened is that some of Niebuhr's opponents (as well as his students) have profited from his instruction. Consequently they have shifted their ground, even when perhaps they still remain as advocates of previous policies and positions. There is something paradoxical in this fact that the opponents remain even while the content of the argument changes. It reminds us that much of the argument is ideological, i.e. that we are dealing with a deep-seated social conflict in which the battlefield is social and political as much as it is religious. Churchmen, too, are caught in the network of institutional involvement, and most persons for most of the time (as Niebuhr so well knows) speak out in terms of their involvements, not apart from them.

For this reason it is perfectly proper and appropriate to characterize the goal of Niebuhr's ethic in social and political terms. For the constant thrust of his ethical discussions is to provide the less privileged with greater opportunities for material well-being, physical health and security, and social and political freedom. The method for achieving this goal has been consistently to win for their groups (individual persons, socio-economic strata, or nations) an assured place within the organization of public life, i.e. to make access to these goods a matter of structural right, not one of charitable privilege. Finally—and here Niebuhr would part company with many of his political companions—to see these activities both as required acts of Christian responsibility on the part of the church member and as the provision of the necessary framework within which the Gospel can be proclaimed as meaningful. The goals of this ethic are finally

instrumental and relative; the faith which provides their impetus and which expresses itself through them is always primary.

One may, of course, characterize this political program as liberal; nevertheless, it is not liberal in either the modern collective or in the older laissez-faire form. For where the liberals trust in man and his possibilities, Niebuhr distrusts man as a being always bound by his self-interest. Where collectivists absolutize structure, Niebuhr insists on its relativity. His closest approach to sanctifying any status quo is his acceptance of the welfare goals of the modern democratic state.

In the application of this ethic Niebuhr is highly consistent. In part this consistency arises from the maintenance of his stance over against love, in part from the fact that he has primarily concerned himself with political issues, issues of justice. Equally consistent is his analysis of self-interest. Here his clear perception of the structure of society, of the "facts of life" in politics and economics, stand him in good stead. Still surprisingly good reading, for example, is his analysis of the situation of the Ford worker in 1926.[6] Rooted in a deep pastoral concern, Niebuhr's essay reveals even at this early date in the formation of his thought an amazing quality of realism, his knack of recognizing sentimental humbug as humbug, even when it is pious humbug as well. In fact, we must never forget that if Niebuhr's analyses seem commonplace today, they were not so when they were written. Many of these essays were forged in the heat of controversy, and Niebuhr's voice was often a minority voice reminding us that the inside of the cup was dirty, that evil things lay hidden behind righteous appearances.

Niebuhr and his Audiences

Niebuhr is also highly consistent in his conception of the audiences to which he is speaking. They are interesting audiences which by their very composition ask for Niebuhrian analysis and require his prophetic stance. Contrary to the customs of many pulpits, Niebuhr addresses his indictment to the well-to-do, to the righteous, to the people of good intentions, to the "good Christians." Good Christians are, of course, accustomed to religious exhortations; almost every Sunday in thousands of pulpits they are encouraged to love, to sacrifice, to give gen-

6 "How Philanthropic is Henry Ford?" pp. 98-103. Originally in *The Christian Century*, Dec. 9, 1926.

erously, to be unselfish. It is those on the outside who are called to repentance. Niebuhr reversed this process—openly, with a clear knowledge and intent. For it was those who sat simultaneously in the cushioned pews of leading Protestant churches, the pillars of the denominations, and also in the seats of the mighty in the market place who needed to hear the voice of the prophet.

> The most important ministry of reconciliation on the part of the church must be to the privileged classes, not only because the church has the ear of these classes to a greater degree than that of the disinherited, but also because the privileged classes are most tempted to identify their particular interests with the eternal sanctities and with the peace and order of society. When privileged groups fighting for their rights claim to be fighting for God and all the angels, they become truly demonic, and nothing will exorcise these demons but the worship of the true God. If the church is to reduce the fury of the righteous man who does not know how unrighteous he is, it will have to be more than a socio-moral institution. It will have to be a religio-moral fellowship in which there is some sense of a holiness which transcends all human perfections and imperfections (pp. 44, 45).

Here again we must emphasize that what is striking in the prophetic address to this audience is the content of the message, not its quality of exhortation. "Good Christians" are accustomed to being reminded from the pulpit of the pitfalls of personal sin, of the dangers of temptation, of the necessity of faith and righteousness. They are not accustomed, however, to seeing their most respectable pursuits, even their deeds of charity, subjected to prophetic scrutiny and condemnation. Yet Niebuhr continually reminds such "good Christians" as are found in the pews regularly each Sunday that they are guilty of the sins of exploitation, that they are the respectable but silent profiteers from the unjust distribution of power and privilege. They are the ones who confuse class interest with justice, who can praise private philanthropy to the downtrodden as a religious virtue par excellence and simultaneously oppose any political change to improve the lot of the downtrodden and possibly reduce their numbers. An ethic of "love" without a sense of structure is precisely their cup of tea, for it enables them to be comfortably virtuous, secure in the knowledge that their goodness will never threaten the places they now occupy. But an ethic of justice addressed to them must first of all demand insight into the "structured injustice" which may accompany

personal piety. Secondly, it must speak to them as sinners who must not only change themselves but who must recognize the need for change in the structures of life.

How did Niebuhr's audiences respond to this kind of prophetic discourse? The present book is not, of course, the best source for an answer to this question. But the question can be rephrased to provide insight into the relationship between Niebuhr and his audiences. To what actual audiences did Niebuhr speak? How are these audiences related to those whom he identifies as supporters or as opponents?

Here it is important to recognize that during the most active part of his career as a prophet he has spoken from the chair of a seminary professorship, not from an urban pulpit. This is not said to suggest that Niebuhr would have pulled his punches or compromised his positions; rather, it points to the kinds of involvements and the kinds of issues which would arise from his prophetic discourse. Speaking from a single pulpit, no matter how courageously, would in the end, the power structures of congregations and denominations being what they are, have left him in the role of a minor and probably ineffectual voice in the industrial wilderness. Speaking to generations of students in a seminary free of denominational commitments, he helped create a new climate of ethical discourse in American Protestantism. He became multiplied a thousandfold.

To this audience of students and pastors (reached also through guest lectureships at unnumbered conferences and convocations) must be added the readers of *The Nation, The Christian Century, Christianity and Crisis,* and other periodicals as well as of his books. In this group one can identify two, possibly three, kinds of followers; by contrast, knowing also who Niebuhr's critics are, we can identify his antagonists.

His first audience and following, then, is found among his students of the last quarter century. This has been an interesting and in many ways receptive audience (though one that is rarely addressed directly in these essays). For if his students came, for the most part, from the respectable and devout segments of the church, their presence at Union Seminary indicated intellectual capacity, theological rebellion (otherwise many of them would have entered denominational seminaries), and a readiness for that kind of self-examination which has always been a part of the Protestant heritage at its best. It is to this

self-examination in terms of their own unconscious self-interests, both personal and socio-economic, that Niebuhr directed his students. Their own uneasy consciences, especially in the troubled decade of the depression, made them a peculiarly receptive audience. Thus in very fact Niebuhr conducted a school of the prophets.

At the same time, he found an audience outside the churches. For his ethic made him aware that the battles for justice are often fought (should one say always?) by those who stand outside the pale of respectability. Thus he could find allies in labor leaders, radical politicians, and intellectuals of all kinds. True, they often failed either to comprehend or to accept the theological position from which he spoke, but they found a common devotion to justice sufficient for their purposes. In fact, Niebuhr's name is perhaps as well known among the intelligentsia outside the church as in any other circles. This audience, moreover, rejoiced in his attacks on the entrenched complacency of Protestantism.

The third, perhaps more doubtfully loyal, audience I would define as those of his own generation. To these he spoke not so much as a guide and preceptor as he did as gadfly and critic. They were his fellow-pastors, teachers, and church leaders. The best of them are the spiritual leaders of this generation. To them, more recently, must be added British and Continental church leaders. With these at best Niebuhr has conducted a dialog, at worst a controversial debate. But they must surely be counted in the audience to which he addressed himself. They reviewed his books, they responded to his questionings, and in their deliberations they implicitly or explicitly took into account the positions he advocated. Thus, most significantly of all, in the directions in which their leadership consciously or unconsciously has moved the American churches, we find perhaps the best indication of what Niebuhr's prophetic discourse has said to his own generation. No one would claim, least of all the sociologically-oriented Niebuhr, that one man's voice could lead the polyglot troops of American Protestantism. Yet I believe an honest appraisal of the policy declarations of the major Protestant bodies and the editorial pages of *Christianity and Crisis* would show some remarkable convergences. Whatever weight one may assign to the work of Reinhold Niebuhr, the level of discussion and the moral climate in which that discussion occurs have moved in the same direction that he has. At least to some degree the prophetic goading of

his voice may be seen as an element in the gradual detachment of significant sectors of American Protestantism from the naive identification of socio-economic self-interests and the will of God.

It is no less interesting to call the role of those who belong to the opposition. If Niebuhr's following may be considered rather motley, containing as it did maverick students of theology and radical intellectuals and also respectable churchmen, his opposition has consisted of equally strange bed-fellows. For here we must include the old-fashioned liberal, the camp from which Niebuhr deserted, the fundamentalists, and the sophisticated "evangelicalists"[7] who view Niebuhr's theology with double suspicion, for not only did he fail to return from theological liberalism to "orthodoxy" (and to call Niebuhr neo-orthodox is surely semantic abuse) but he frequently outdid the liberals in his espousal of radical political positions. Finally, probably feeling ill at ease among these men of the cloth, we must count many sincere and responsible Christian laymen, doing the best they knew how according to the piety they had learned and yet being opponents of Niebuhr almost by definition, without conscious choice. For although many of these laymen had never read Niebuhr, it was their theology which was often implicitly under attack.

While one could no doubt document for each of these groups their own reasons for being on the opposing side, what is striking is rather that they have something in common. For far more unites these strange companions than a common position as "the enemy" in the writings of Reinhold Niebuhr. They are indeed an interesting demonstration of the ideological quality of much contemporary theology. Despite extremely divergent beliefs in theology, liberals, evangelicalists, and laymen come out with essentially the same set of ethical propositions —i.e. with a pious individualistic ethic of love, forgiveness, and baskets for the poor at Christmas. The entire focus of their Christian life is in the individual. This is indeed in a variety of disguises a *Kultur-protestantismus* content to rescue individuals from the fire, whether by revivalism or by the more sophisticated techniques of pastoral counseling, but which does not touch the heart of the matter, the structure of society and the distribution of power in it.

If the liberals dislike Niebuhr, I suspect it is not just because he

7 To allow these people to appropriate the name "evangelical" is surely an abuse of what this word has meant to many generations of Lutherans.

is willing to talk about sin and guilt (after all, they seem quite enamored of analytical psychology) but because he has accused them of straining at the gnats of individual maladjustment and swallowing the camel of social injustice. Because he has not been willing to counsel the underdog to find his solution in "love" but rather, in the manner of the early leaders of labor, he has answered defeat with a single battle-cry, "Organize."

If the fundamentalist sees Niebuhr as a major opponent, despite his attacks on liberals, is it not precisely because by his assault on *Kulturprotestantismus* he has succeeded in helping to open a wide gap between the complacent middle-class oriented Christianity of the pews and the critical orientation of the pulpit in many denominations? If, in brief, the split between the pew and the pulpit in many instances is a political as well as a theological one, is this not a reflection of the crucial nature of the issues which Niebuhr has raised for the last three decades? The heart of the matter today, moreover, does not lie primarily in the nature of the social and political arrangements as such; it lies in questioning whether any social system may be endowed with the kind of religious sanctity with which much American Protestantism has anointed "the American way of life." If in the pages of *Christianity Today* the Protestant ministry of the larger denominations is constantly under fire, the attack is as frequently launched on political and economic issues as on theological ones. In fact, one can hardly separate them. While indeed even today many pastors in the theologically more sophisticated denominations remain individualists, yet there is in each of them a restless circle of those who with Niebuhr, consciously or unconsciously, have repudiated the ethical principles of the older American religious tradition.

The identity of position of liberals and evangelicalists runs to techniques of help as well as to prescriptions of love. For whether the catchword is "conversion" or "adjustment," "insight therapy" or "repentance," the pattern is one of treating individuals, not that of dealing with organizations. By the personal ministrations of the clergyman-counselor, the "sinner" or "client" is helped to change his personal mode of response. He is made into a different individual, undoubtedly often more effective in his personal life, more successful. Virtue has its own rewards.

It has its social consequences too. For this technique not only re-

moves the minister from the ranks of the advocates of radical structural change, it provides him with precisely the tools with which both he and his "parishioner-clients" can accept the status quo and live with it.

The respectable and religiously concerned layman notices what has happened. He sees religion flourish, ne'er-do-wells become industrious, and piety reap its profits. He cannot really be blamed, considering the ease with which virtue and success have always been equated, for looking with approval upon these events. He is thus often completely baffled and genuinely disturbed in his sincere religious convictions when he hears that this very piety may also be a form of the perpetuation of injustice.

Against such an ethic and against such self-deception Niebuhr turned his analytical scrutiny. In doing so, he went to the heart of the matter, the distribution of power. And since his prophetic criticism has thus always been invovled with the question of power, Niebuhr's theology had necessarily to be a polemical one. Theology has always meant, consciously or unconsciously, a choosing of sides, a division of the audience into friends and enemies. In other words, Niebuhr's involvement in action rather than in contemplation, in social reform rather than in pastoral counseling, has meant that he has always retained a clear sense of the ideological dimension of discourse, of the use of words to cover and protect self-interest. The structure of his discourse has therefore usually been that of the debate rather than the discussion.

The redeeming quality of Niebuhr's role in this debate has been his "unprincipled" procedure, i.e. his refusal to be simply the advocate of a set of political, theological, or ethical slogans. *Theologically put*, it has been his constant awareness of the *simul justus ac peccator* quality of all discourse, including his own.[8]

But the role of the prophet has its limitations, even the role of the prophet who recognizes that he is grinding axes along with his opponents. Here Niebuhr seems caught in the middle. For his very recognition that men must act from the place where they stand, including the office which they hold, involves him in exactly that kind of dual ethic of which Troeltsch accused Luther. For to recognize that one cannot expect the "office-holder" to act in terms of pure dis-

8 In this context it is interesting to note Niebuhr's contrast between religious idealism and religious realism (p. 46).

interested love (the personal ethic) means that at best one can expect from him a responsible conduct of his office, but not a Utopian, purely Christian one.

Nowhere does this come out more clearly than in Niebuhr's writings on war. For his refutation of the pacifist is always that in the final analysis no one in a position of responsibility can really act according to the pure ideal of the Gospel. A man must do what a man must do. But to say this is to concede that in terms of the Gospel itself, the pacifist is right, but his ideas are impractical; the realist is wrong, but his ideas work. The result is a kind of double ethic. Where Niebuhr's insight goes beyond the usual Lutheran defense against the charges of a "double ethic" is in his recognition, spelled out negatively in his criticisms but not expanded positively, that no man ever stands in purely "personal" relationships. A purely personal ethic is an ethic that cannot be practiced because none of us ever stands in a situation where he can practice it. Even my informal, intimate relationships with the members of my family or with my friends are already social, and I could not even stand in these relationships if they were not undergirded by a more impersonal social structure.

The Latent Assumptions

It is at this point that we must begin to look for the hidden elements in Niebuhr's thought. For, as the discussion of pacifism indicates, a pure love ethic, that which Niebuhr identifies as the "ethic of Jesus," is in fact emptied of meaning. Now, this could mean, and Niebuhr sometimes sounds that way, that the ethic of Jesus is actually irrelevant. This is not true, of course, even for Niebuhr, for he constantly appeals to love as a motive for justice. Still he makes this appeal in a very strange way, for since the love ethic of the Gospel is a "perfectionist" ethic, love always defines an ultimate goal, but the proximate goal is defined in terms of justice.

The key to this situation lies in understanding the background out of which Niebuhr came. For "the ethic of Jesus" against which Niebuhr directs his attacks is, of course, not primarily an ethic learned from the study of the Gospels. It is rather the ethical system of liberalism and the Social Gospel. (It is also the ethic of the evangelicalists and the pious laity.) Coming out of this background Niebuhr ac-

cepted the liberal construction of the Gospels as correct. Reacting against the sentimental and ineffectual practice of this ethic, he did not (nor should we blame him) sit down and reconstruct an ethic from the Gospel. That is, after all, the task of the New Testament scholar. Instead, accepting the dominant interpretation as correct, he attacked the ethic as inadequate. He attacked it, moreover, on the basis of his own personal involvements in the moral issues of his ministry. We must not forget his Detroit parish and the urgencies of the great depression as well as the pacifist movement of the period after World War I. In such a context a man could not remain "distinterested."

Thus we must never overlook the context within which Niebuhr speaks. For example, what strikes one at first glance in the famous article on Ford is that its orientation is totally sociological; it speaks with the assurance of the man who has seen facts. In it we discern the prophet conscious of the structure of power, and already conscious of the discrepancies between a sentimental personal ethic and the impersonal industrial behemoth. So also, in his socialist days, we find the same consciousness of the paradox of "moral man" and "immoral society," the same awareness of the context within which action must take place.

But one question remains unanswered. Why did the prophet care? He could have withdrawn into the protected life of personal intimacy and devoted himself to marriage counseling, or he could have abandoned the Gospel entirely and become a complete Marxist. (No doubt this course was highly tempting; as we know, some took it.)

Although Niebuhr never spells it out explicitly, the answer is, I believe, that the ethic of the Gospel is not in fact an ethic of "disinterested love." Disinterest is emotionally lukewarm; it is the ethic of the uninvolved, the uncommitted, of "scientific Christianity," in which reason has destroyed emotion. It is, in fact, the caricature of love. But the Gospel is never uninvolved or uncommitted; self-denial is not neutral; it is an act of complete involvement, giving myself, throwing my life away.

The ethic of the Gospel is therefore an ethic of *compassion;* it is an ethic of *total interestedness.* Put in Niebuhr's terms, every man's involvement in decision rules out disinterest. To be a disinterested Christian is in fact a contradiction. If the ethic of the Gospel were in reality an ethic of disinterest, it would indeed be irrelevant. Such a

description does violence to the Gospel record—to the meaning of the incarnation, the passion, and the crucifixion.

The weakness in Niebuhr's ethic lies in his definition of love; both the definition coming from his liberal heritage and his redefinition are incorrect. For the answer to the sentimentalism of the liberal and of the fundamentalist is not to put love beyond history but to rediscover the biblical meaning of love as total involvement and compassion.

Furthermore, we must never forget that when Niebuhr wrote about Ford, he was also writing as the pastor of men who worked in the Ford plant. He was writing as one who had seen, with the eyes of one responsible, the sufferings, the bitterness, the hypocrisy. He saw with responsible eyes, for he was the pastor of these men and he had to speak to them in their homes and from his pulpit. Underlying his essay on Ford, strengthening its realism, putting the edge on its sharpest insights, is his understanding sympathy with the plight of the worker.

I have a suspicion that Niebuhr has always been as much a pastor as a prophet. For it is precisely the pastor who becomes involved, whether he wishes to or not, in the practical issues of economics, politics, and power. It is the pastor, much more than the professor, who must accept responsibility. And it is the pastor, too, who usually knows how weak and frail are the very persons to whose side he must rally and whom he must encourage and support.

One would need to know a good deal more about Niebuhr's Detroit ministry, perhaps also about other facets of his life, to trace this compassion to its sources. It is interesting that he never spells it out explicitly. On the theoretical level the ethic of the Gospel remains "disinterestedness" and therefore irrelevant. But his practice is consistently compassionate.

Here I believe is the underlying key to Niebuhr's ethic. For how else understand the existential quality of his discourse unless one recognizes that for this man responsibility is never an abstract principle, but something personally felt, that his writing is never dispassionate, for always he has already chosen a side, that of the weak, the poor, the exploited, and by the same token he has already made an enemy of the strong, the rich, the respectable. Here is the key to the understanding of his essays on the Jewish problem, for he writes

out of a deeply felt sympathy for those who have suffered, and he rejects every abstract solution of the problem. Here, too, is the key to his apostasy from "socialism," for he saw in its doctrinaire qualities a willingness to accept suffering as the price of power. Here, too, is the key to his critique of the older pacifist position, for again he sees the pacifist as one who may actually increase suffering rather than decrease it.

Here too lies the key to understanding his description of justice. For justice in Niebuhr's ethic is never the equivalent of natural law or of a rule of "to each his own." It is a justice permeated by compassion, that is, a justice that always insists that the structures of society must be re-ordered so that the poor and the weak are strengthened and encouraged. Justice at its best must therefore always be an expression of the love of the Gospel, not "disinterested" (even if that were possible) but an institutional embodiment of compassionate concern. Thus the explicit point of many of Niebuhr's essays is often the support or rejection of a practical public policy. It is a concern for the organization of economic life, of political relationships, of the international order.

Certainly no one who has not himself been involved in the struggle for justice should belittle the importance of this ethical position. Yet the very realism required for its practice contains also the hidden temptation. The temptation lies not merely in the abandonment of the optimistic goals of a liberal social program, but that in the very radical awareness of every man's selfish interest, in the radical scepticism directed at the sentimental liberalism of the past, the prophet may himself be tempted to accept more of the status quo than the realities of the situation require. Radical positions on social issues are not necessarily unrealistic or Utopian. Specifically, in dealing with the contemporary problems of war and of economic organization, a realistic Christian ethic may, it seems to me, go beyond the positions Niebuhr has been espousing. Furthermore, a responsible Christian social ethic at its most realistic, conceding that what is politically possible may indeed be a relatively small gain, needs at the same time to maintain the tension between what the Gospel requires and what man can do, needs always to continue to goad the consciences of all groups into uneasiness. (This, it seems to me, is precisely what the Cleveland statement on World Order undertook to do; that Niebuhr approves

is itself an indication that the pressures of the Gospel continue to push him beyond his old positions as situations change.)

One final point needs to be argued. It is a small point, a matter of application primarily. As one reads his essays, one finds in them little awareness of the structure of the organized church or of the local congregation. In part this is natural enough; it can be understood from the nature of his audience. Yet, if this ethic of responsible and compassionate concern for justice is to be effective in the churches, it must become effective through the structures that exist. In large part perhaps this has been the task of his students as they have gone into their parishes, yet one wonders at times whether the significant social action of the individual pastor in the contemporary community would not be made stronger if the organized church actually undergirded his action in some effectual way. Within the loosely organized, pluralistically oriented world of American Protestantism this would not be easy, yet the difficulty of the task only serves to underline its vital necessity.

Lutheran Appraisals of Niebuhr

It is inevitable that a man who comes out of an "impure" Lutheran background should be the object of suspicion among Lutherans. I am not concerned to defend the "Lutheran" qualities of Niebuhr's thought. But two points are important. First, if Niebuhr's views of Luther and Lutheranism have struck us as one-sided and unfair, in part this is the natural reaction to Lutheran isolation in America. Given the quality of most American Lutheranism in the 1920's, what else should a man say? Given the fact, too, that even though Luther's ethic was not indeed a dual ethic, how should anyone in America have known otherwise, since in fact most Lutherans practiced just this kind of ethic. Further, the Lutherans themselves remained largely ignorant of Luther, and the scholarship of the Luther Renaissance remains to this day largely untranslated. And even those who concerned themselves with Luther did not concern themselves with the issues of ethics. Not a single significant American Lutheran work on social ethics came out of American Lutheranism between the death of Stuckenberg and the end of World War II. For the man whose primary interest was not indeed Luther research, what other interpretation could be placed on Lutheranism than that provided by Troeltsch?

Second, if many Lutherans, making common cause with the evangelicalists and the respectable church members found Niebuhr's political views too radical and his social criticisms too uncomfortable, perhaps this is because they had forgotten certain basic Lutheran teachings on the nature of the Christian life and the necessity for daily self-examination. I am not suggesting that a radical social position is more virtuous than a conservative one. This is a totally un-Lutheran mode of thought. For it assumes that one social or political alignment is more worthy of God's approval than another. But this is not the form in which the Christian moral confrontation occurs. Before God I must always be aware of the limitations and corruptions of the choices I make. Yet I know that I must respond, in faith and in obedience. Within the human situation, however, I may and must test my actions in very specific ways. Do they flow out of genuine compassion? Do they contribute to the enhancement of justice? Are they a realistically practical solution? How will they leave the balance of power and self-interest? Giving the "correct" answers will not serve to "justify" me; God has already done that. The process may, however, make me a more effectual Christian citizen in my community. Thus the attack on Niebuhr's "radicalism" is for the most part theologically and ethically irrelevant because it has been based primarily on false premises. It is, to repeat and emphasize what was said in the paragraph above, the paradox of Luther research that the social dimensions of Luther's ethic (as opposed to the theological) have remained so long unexplored. Despite the possible insights of the two-kingdom theory, has Lutheran social thought both here and abroad been primarily a defense of the status quo? Has not the inner mission until recently, with few exceptions, been largely an enterprise in private philanthropy, not a responsible grappling with social issues?

Niebuhr's distinction between love and justice may indeed be simply the analogue of that favorite Lutheran theological pair, Law and Gospel. We are called rightly to divide the word of truth. Perhaps what Reinhold Niebuhr has done for us is to suggest that so long as we sentimentalize the Gospel and enshrine Law in the temple of the status quo, we cannot possibly discharge our responsibility. Different indeed these two are, but not separate, for they are but the right hand and the left hand of God, and he governs the world with both

hands. Let us honor Niebuhr, not by petulant disagreement or partisan attacks, but by honest, responsible devotion to the same task.

A responsible examination of the task of social ethics would most certainly see it as that of an ethic of compassion. It is hardly necessary, I believe, to argue for the biblical quality of this position. But it is essential that it be understood that an ethic of compassion, one that identifies itself with the sinner even as the man farthest down, cannot be divided into a personal and a public ethic. This distinction (and all the false problems following upon it) falls by the wayside. The ethic of compassion is always an ethic of relationship, an ethic of the I-Thou relationship, seeing the neighbor in every man in need and being the Christ to every distressed person. Like the Samaritan, therefore, it uses the structures of society to help the neighbor and never refuses its assistance to any man, no matter what his distress. It is not accidental, perhaps, that those who practiced the "religious" ethic in the parable of the good Samaritan were the priest and the Levite, who would have violated the ritual cleanliness if they had succored the man fallen among the thieves. The man who practiced the social ethic, the ethic of "compassion," and in the process utilized the existing structures of society (charging the innkeeper with the care of the victim) was the Samaritan outcast.

Reinhold Niebuhr has in his own way been a Good Samaritan to the respectable churchmen of America.

John Stough, Founder of Ohio Lutheranism

By Willard D. Allbeck

THE importance of John Stough[1] is usually seen as related to the fact that he was a pioneer pastor, the first Lutheran clergyman in Ohio. Beyond this is his leadership in the organizing of pastors and congregations into an important synod. He is significant also as representing the problems and conflicts inherent in the adaptation of a foreign language group to American patterns. He not only witnessed but also contributed to the economic transformation of isolated forest clearings into established communities with small industries. Though he had traveled forest trails he lived long enough to see the results of the building of roads, canals, and railroads. Looking back over his years he wrote in his memoirs,[2] "As we were breaking our way into the wilderness we did not find turnpikes, macadamized roads, bridges, canals, railroads, and such like facilities for traveling, but we had to take our compass for our guide, and ax and cut our way in many places through and around hills and rocks."[3]

Stough's life spanned the years 1762 to 1845. Geographically it extended from York County, Pa., into Maryland, West Virginia, western Pennsylvania, and thence into Ohio. His first Ohio residence was near Lisbon in Columbiana County. His last years were spent in Crawford County. Beyond these areas his preaching tours took him many miles from home, even into Kentucky. His report for 1807 indicated that he had traveled about 1,300 miles the previous year.[4]

Physically he was well equipped for the rugged life of the frontier.

1 This is the English spelling he used. In German he wrote "Johannes Stauch." Translators have often retained the German spelling.

2 His "Autobiography" in English translation made by his son Samuel is in the library of the Historical Society at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. It has appeared in print as follows: *The Lutheran Standard*, 1907, numbers 42, 43, 44; H. M. Smiley *et al.*, *History of the Bowman Family* (Lisbon, Ohio, 1909); C. V. Sheatsley, *History of the Joint Synod of Ohio* (Columbus, 1919); E. B. Burgess, *Memorial History of the Pittsburgh Synod* (Greenville, Pa., 1925). The German original has not been located.

3 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

4 *Documentary History of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1898), p. 380.

He was described as being tall and robust.[5] M. M. Gilbreth in telling of Stough's death said that he had a "large athletic frame."[6] In his memoirs he wrote, "My long frame begins to bend under the weight of three score and ten years. My once strong step now begins to falter. My stentorious voice that had been my faithful servant for many years began to fail in both speaking and singing."[7] He had enough stamina to carry him through eighty-three and a half years of life. Almost all his children lived into their seventies or eighties.[8] This is evidence of the strong constitution which was the family heritage. Thus our impression of him is of a big man with a big voice.

Before becoming a frontiersman Stough served an apprenticeship as a wagonmaker in York, Pa., 1782-86, and worked for a year thereafter as journeyman in Hagerstown, Md.[9] This training with woodworking tools was certainly useful on the frontier. It was an industrial skill added to knowledge of farming. He had an interest therefore in combining industry with agriculture. In Columbiana County, Ohio, on June 4, 1808, he paid $480 for 160 acres of land in section eight, Center Township, bought from Bezaleel Wells who had large holdings in Jefferson, Columbiana, and Stark Counties.[10] Two months later he sold fifty acres of this land for $150 to his son-in-law, John Jacob Bowman.[11] On this land a tannery and a sawmill were erected at early dates by Bowman along Cold Run. This was the sort of thing Stough encouraged. It is precisely the thing he did when he first settled as a pioneer near what is now Aurora, Preston County, W. Va. This fact is celebrated by a tablet erected by the Historical Society which reads, "Rev. John Stough and family settled at Mount Carmel about 1787, and about 1790 Stough started the first gristmill." Yet the basic source of his livelihood was always the farm. After leaving Columbiana County he located in Crawford County, where on April 20, 1829, he paid Perez and Clarissa Hillard $350 for 80 acres in section twenty-seven, township two, south of range seven-

5 Smiley, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
6 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 34.
8 Smiley, *op. cit.*, pp. 48 f.
9 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
10 *Columbiana County Record of Deeds*, Vol. I, p. 403.
11 *Ibid.*, p. 433. Stough sold him the remaining 110 acres on March 17, 1829, for $1,137. *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, p. 426. The price indicates either the increased value of the land or the inclusion of buildings. Bowman later became a district judge. Smiley, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

teen.[12] There his land adjoined that of his son, John G. Stough, and there he remained the rest of his life.

Craftsman, pioneer, farmer—it was not these activities but rather the fact that he was the leading Lutheran clergyman in Ohio for the first third of the nineteenth century that makes him especially noteworthy. This other work was the base for maintaining his career as a pastor. The record of his life is to be found in church publications rather than civic documents. And when in his eighty-first year he wrote his memoirs he told of his preaching rather than his crops.

According to his own account, the first impulses toward the ministerial office grew out of the training received in his home. They became conscious when he was nineteen years old. His parents, Gottfried and Charlotte Kessler Stauch, were German immigrants whom he described as "poor but pious." Concerning his training he wrote, "My mother exercised strict parental and Christian discipline over her children. As soon as they could lisp a language she taught them maxims, prayers, and verses from the Bible, many of which remain indelibly impressed on my mind and conscience until this day of three-score and ten years."[13] He remembered the urge to become a preacher and expressed it in these words: "This is now the nineteenth year, and woe is me if I do not obey the call."[14] For this he had his parents' consent but failed to get the expected enthusiastic encouragement from his pastor, who advised him instead to hold the matter in abeyance until with the passing of time the call to the ministry became unmistakably clear.

The extent of his education cannot be determined. Defects in it are apparent in misspellings and Americanisms in his German records. He was aware of his limitations, commenting, "I have often mourned over the golden time I lost from school in my youth which has caused me to labor under sore disadvantages all my long life for the liberal education which I might have obtained by proper encouragement and use of opportunity."[15] He had advanced far enough, however, to teach school some months after his pastor's rebuff. This was good experience for him since it made possible further study on his own initiative and prepared him for the time when as pastor he would be conducting

12 *Crawford County Record of Deeds*, Vol. I, p. 248.
13 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
14 *Ibid.*
15 *Ibid.*, p. 36.

schools in his congregations. Teaching school was in fact for some clergymen a prelude to the ministry. But the experience of teaching a little German school was soon over, and he began making wagons, some of which may have traveled westward to the frontier.

Whether it was the rolling wagons, or the tales of the county surveyor whose daughter he married, or some other adventurous incitement cannot be recovered, but soon after his marriage to Elizabeth Haguemyer (Hogmeier) early in 1787 they and another couple started west from Hagerstown. On March 24 they arrived at the spot where they decided to locate, now Aurora, W. Va.[16] Other settlers joined them in the vicinity. Mrs. Stough's father and some other persons arrived in 1789, bringing among other things a copy of "Dr. Malvo's Sermon Book as a gift from the parent church, St. John's, in Hagerstown."[17] Stough's recollection was: "Our Hagerstown fathers were mindful of our spiritual as well as our temporal destitution. Having no living ministry to send us, they sent us a sermon-book at their earliest opportunity and earnestly entreated us that we should assemble every Sabbath and praise God by singing and reading prayers and sermons, which we did every Sabbath with good effect. . . . I had been chosen to lead and read sermons and uniformly to lead in our religious exercises."[18] Thus he became a lay-reader.

Two years later he began preaching, not only in his own community but also in Morgantown and to the north in Pennsylvania, where congregations in Fayette and Washington Counties were formed that year. Such activity naturally led to requests for other kinds of ministerial services, especially weddings. "A young man and woman came to us soon after our settling in our new home and requested me to marry them. He was tall and straight with a tawny complexion, a dark and restless eye, barefooted and clad from a little below the knees upwards with skins of animals. He carried his gun upon his shoulder, shot-pouch and powder-horn by his side, and his game in his hand, and his bride close by following him, who was also clad with the habiliments of the forest. . . . He with a manly countenance, she with a mischievous smile upon her lip, asked to be married. We

16 Karl K. Gower, *The Aurora Documents* (Oakland, Md., 1957), p. 19.

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 19. Haguemyer had "surveyed one thousand acres of land in this wilderness and entered one hundred acres of it to his son-in-law." Smiley, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

18 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 f.

told them we had no license to perform a legal marriage. Now they said they did not care, they intended to live together at any rate, and there was no minister in the county. . . . We concluded after mature deliberation that we had better solemnize their nuptials. . . . I accordingly did it backwoods style, without any license myself or asking them for one. Others came on the same business, and I served them also."[19] Soon afterwards, however, he was advised to obtain legal authorization from the court, and this he did. But he refused to administer the sacraments.

The sudden death of his wife early in 1793 precipitated a crisis. He took his four small children to his wife's people is Hagerstown and proceeded on to Philadelphia to attend the convention of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania the last days of May. According to the Minutes, "A certain Johannes Stauch handed in a petition from Virginia asking for admission. Several congregations are in that region without a preacher."[20] The convention "Resolved: That Mr. Stauch receive a license as catechist in Redstone, Morgantown, and Salem, under the supervision of the ordained preacher in Martinsburg."[21] The rank of "catechist" was at the bottom of the clerical scale with the understanding that advancement was contingent upon progress in supervised study.

On his return from the convention he made his headquarters in Fayette County, Pa., and from there extended the range of his activities. The following June he attended the next convention of the Ministerium, held in Reading, Pa., and as evidence of his studies submitted two sermons for examination. Since his progress was satisfactory, and especially since he was in an isolated parish, he was advanced to the rank of "candidate." The Minutes read: "Resolved: That on account of the great distance from an ordained preacher, Catechist Stauch be granted a full license, but that it extend only over Redstone and other congregations near it on the frontier."[22] But this gave him both plenty of work and plenty of latitude. According to his Autobiography he had ten preaching places covering about 160 miles where he preached every four weeks.[23] A memento of his work at that

19 *Ibid.*

20 *Documentary History of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania*, p. 265.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 268. In modern names Redstone means Brownsville, Pa., and Salem is Aurora, W. Va.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 273.

23 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

time is a hand-painted baptismal certificate on display in the library of Capital University in Columbus, Ohio. It is signed by Stough and dated May 30, 1794, at Washington County, Pennsylvania.

The 1795 convention of the Ministerium was held in Philadelphia, and Stough was absent without excuse. But the next year he attended when it was held in his home community, York, Pa. Perhaps he had his bride, Catherine Troutman, with him, for they had been married on May 21. Likely at this time he got his children at Hagerstown and brought them to be with their step-mother in the Fayette County parsonage.

Stough was absent from five of the next seven conventions. But in 1804 when the Ministerium convened in Easton, Pa., he was present and was advanced from the rank of candidate to that of pastor. His ordination occurred on May 30.[24] It was thus as a regularly ordained pastor that Stough settled in Ohio late in 1806.

His coming to Ohio was the result of two circumstances arising about the turn of the century. One was the continued movement of population westward into the Northwest Territory, part of which presently became the State of Ohio. The other was the appearance of revivals of religion on the frontier. The first of these was distressing enough when it involved Stough's parishioners; the second was so disturbing as to precipitate a crisis.

German-speaking pioneers continued to move westward from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and other states. Family names in the records at Aurora appear again in records of southwestern Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio. As Stough's parishioners moved, he kept such contact with them as he could. He extended his tours to include their new settlements, urging them to gather their neighbors and form a congregation. In this way Stough visited Ohio apparently as early as 1802. Some former parishioner usually was the nucleus of a German-speaking congregation that was Lutheran and Reformed in most instances, following the pattern farther east.

In Ohio it was in Columbiana County that the first evidence of his tours appeared. In the latter part of 1802 he is reported to have "held preaching services at the cabin of Adam Rupert, a veteran of the Revolutionary War. He lived in Unity Township, Columbiana County,

24 *Documentary History,* pp. 346 f.

Ohio. A congregation was organized, and a log church built in 1803 or 1804. It was called 'Salem' or 'Union' Church."[25] According to this reporter, "In 1803 Rev. Stough appeared in Springfield Township (now a part of Mahoning County). He organized a congregation there, and a log building was erected a year later on section ten, known as the Forney Section."[26] From the records of this congregation we learn that "on June 4, 1804, the members of the Lutheran and Reformed congregation voted to build a church or meeting house on the land of Peter Meserle."[27] This was known as the "Old Springfield Church." The Record Book states also that "in the year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ 1805, here in the Springfield Church the first church service was held by the Rev. John Stough, preacher of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."[28]

There is other reliable evidence of his Ohio activities in 1805. In his travels he entered Jefferson County, where some of his Pennsylvania parishioners had settled. One of them was John Rinehart (Reinhard), who with his wife Susanna had been confirmed by Stough at Aurora on May 20, 1797.[29] Rinehart gave the following account: "In the year of our Lord 1804, I and my family, in connection with three other families, moved to Jefferson County in the state of Ohio. Upon our arrival here we found five other families which had preceded us, and in the next year another family followed us. Having no minister to break unto us the bread of life, there being no minister of our Church in the whole state, we agreed to meet every Sunday for the purpose of mutual edification by reading, singing and prayer. Soon after this the Rev. Father Stauch, whose former hearers we were, and who may be called the father of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Ohio, visited and encouraged us. He organized us into a congregation under the name of 'Good Hope.' . . ."[30] The first page of the congregation's Record Book says, "In the year 1805 the first preaching in this vicinity was done by a regular missionary sent by the honorable Lutheran Ministerium, namely John Stough. In the year 1806 the con-

25 Smiley, *op. cit.*, p. 45. Cf. Horace Mack, *History of Columbiana County, Ohio* (Philadelphia, 1879), p. 251.

26 *Ibid.*

27 *Parish Record Book, Zion Lutheran Church, New Middletown, Ohio,* p. 1.

28 *Ibid.*

29 Gower, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

30 *The Lutheran Standard,* Jan. 29, 1851. Printed also in Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

gregation was first assembled by John Stough and named Good Hope Church."[31]

His tours of 1805 carried him still farther. In Harrison County he organized Zion Lutheran and Reformed congregation near Germano.[32] In Stark County "the first public church service in the county was held by Father Stauch, the Lutheran preacher, and Father Mahnenschmidt, the Reformed preacher, in Ried's barn in 1805 in the German language, and in the following winter in private dwellings in the English language also."[33] Every such organization added another place for Stough to visit with some regularity every month or so.

The date 1806 can be attached to further developments in Ohio. On one of his trips he baptized the infant daughter of Jacob and Julianna Fachsnacht Barke. The child was born April 2, 1806, in Springfield Township, Columbiana County, and baptized there by Stough on August 3.[34] When he went to Hagerstown for the convention of the Ministerium in May he reported that he had baptized 277 persons, adminstered Communion to 488, buried ten, and was conducting four schools.[35] This was 134 more Baptisms than he had reported two years earlier, an indication of the increased population that was calling Stough westward. The more widely extended area of his ministerial activity was recognized by the Ministerium, which resolved "That Mr. Johann Stauch shall be paid for his labors outside the congregations he has accepted in the State of Ohio, just as other traveling preachers."[36] The greatly expanded demands on his missionary zeal were such a burden on his conscience that he exclaimed, "My heart sickens within me when I behold the wide waste in our beloved Zion. Children baptized within the pale of the church, crying for spiritual food, or instruction, and all for want of laborers in the harvest field. And many that were truly pious were spiritually starving and wandering in the wilderness of sin and lost to the church and to

31 See reprint in Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 729. This record is in the Archives of the Pittsburgh Synod, located at Thiel College, Greenville, Pa.

32 *Ibid.*, pp. 63, 730 f.

33 Johann Raber, "Rückerinnerungen an die frühe Geschichte von Stark County und seine ältesten grösseren Städte," *Der Deutsche Pionier*, 1871, p. 53.

34 The certificate is in the possession of Homer Spickler of New Springfield, Ohio.

35 *Documentary History*, p. 369.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 371.

heaven. Men came as far as thirty miles and told me their deplorable condition, bade me come and preach the Gospel in their houses."[37]

As noted earlier, the other circumstances that impelled Stough to move to Ohio was a crisis connected with revivals. The Second Great Awakening had begun, with special activity being found on the Kentucky frontier. The Cain Ridge camp meeting began in 1801, and others followed. News of such meetings spread widely, with the result that similar religious displays appeared elsewhere. Thus it was that Stough and his Reformed colleagues held a week-long revival in St. Jacob's (St. James?) Church, Fayette County, Pa., in October, 1802. A wave of emotionalism ensued. Some twenty persons fell while seated. "Men and women in perfect health were involuntarily and often suddenly jerked about like persons afflicted with St. Vitus dance, while others fell down and appeared in a state of syncope."[38] On the other hand, some persons who were highly offended left the meeting either in fear or indignation. Thus two factions were created. The anti-revival faction began holding services separate from those conducted by Stough.

A year and a half later the anti-Stough faction formulated charges against him and sent them to the Ministerium. The seven parts of the accusation were: "1st. That I had refused to give the order of the Ministerium when it was demanded. 2nd. That I had made my father-in-law and brother-in-law deacons of the church, so they could do nothing with me. 3rd. That I did not speak a word of German to my family. 4th. That I broke up the German schools. 5th. That I had communed with Rev. Fremmer, a German Reformed. 6th. That I had also taken the Lord's Supper with the Methodists. 7th. That I had stated from the pulpit that no Lutheran should unite in singing at the time of holding the Communion who did not at the same time receive the sacrament."[39] No mention of this appears in the minutes, though he recalled that the charges were examined and rejected. Instead of disciplining Stough, the convention ordained him as we noted earlier. But the dissension at St. Jacob's Church was not abated. A congregational meeting held in June, 1806, to settle the difficulties was unsuccessful. He administered the Lord's Supper there for

37 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
38 *Ibid.*, p. 27.
39 *Ibid.*

the last time August 13 and wound up his affairs so as to move to Ohio in October.

There is no evidence on which to base a judgment of Stough's opinion of the hysterical manifestations in the revival meetings. Generally Lutherans discountenanced such displays. Nor in the charges made against him was he accused of encouraging them. Yet Stough was a pietist with a keen interest in religious experience and strict morals. In his experience there was much benefit to be gained from prayer meetings and religious gatherings in private houses. Before churches were erected, other buildings had to be used. Practices which contributed to religious earnestness were likely to have his endorsement. Yet he was aware that usages arising in other Protestant groups encountered varied reactions among Lutherans. As he observed in his Autobiography, "While some Lutherans approved these meetings and rejoiced greatly, praising the Lord for these rich blessings bestowed upon them, others considered them adiaphoristic, neither good nor bad, but held them as unnecessary meetings, while others held them as conventicles, denouncing them as the rankest kind of diabolical heresy and un-Lutheran in the extreme."[40]

More was involved than merely religious meetings. The adjustments made necessary by the passing of the frontier and the increase of population were part of the story. Stough was involved in the process whereby the isolation of a German-speaking group of Lutherans was being broken down. The results were a greater use of English and a fraternization with Protestants other than the German Reformed. Resistance to revivals was usually coupled with resistance to English and to cooperation with English-speaking Protestants. This is evident in the charges made against Stough to the Ministerium. In the long run he was willing to make the adjustments, even though reluctantly.

In the years following his moving to Ohio Stough, from his farm about five miles west of Lisbon, continued to serve his circuit of congregations in the counties of Columbiana, Harrison, Jefferson, and Stark. For some time he made monthly or bi-monthly trips to the congregations he had served in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. There is a record that he conducted services and installed church

40 *Ibid.*, p. 30.

officers at Aurora, W. Va., on October 24, 1813.[41] A complete list of the Ohio congregations he served is impossible of compilation for lack of surviving records. It would include these churches in Columbiana County: Salem (Union), St. Jacob's (three miles north of Lisbon), St. Martin's (Hanover Township), and North Georgetown. In Mahoning County were the congregations of Poland, Old Springfield, North Lima, Washingtonville, Bethlehem (Youngstown), and Canfield. Synodical records are of little help in completing the list. For example, in 1809 "Pastor Stauch reported fourteen congregations without names in Columbiana, Jefferson, and Trumbull Counties and five vacant congregations."[42] In many instances these were small rural congregations that have disbanded with the passing of the horse-and-buggy days. Neither in most instances have the congregations' records been preserved. What is important is that these Stough congregations were the beach-head for establishing many other congregations which have survived and grown strong.

Soon after his moving to Columbiana County Stough secured from the Court of Common Pleas a license to perform marriages. The license was issued November 18, 1806.[43] His first wedding was that of Christian Crist and Susannah Slosser, December 23, 1806.[44] Through the years Stough was faithful in reporting his weddings to the court. The last marriage he performed in Columbiana County was that of Jacob Bushman and Sarah Rugles, December 23, 1828.

Stough's eyes were open not only for opportunities to organize new Lutheran congregations but also for men who might become pastors in this area already too large for his administration. He is the founder of Ohio Lutheranism not only in the sense that he was the first pastor and organizer on the scene, but also because he was successful in gathering about him a group of associates to help him.

Two possibilities were open to him. One was that of securing from the East some men trained and certified by synods there. The

41 Gower, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

42 *Documentary History,* p. 403.

43 The volume containing this record has disappeared from the Court House at Lisbon. Smiley, who evidently saw the volume, reports that this was the first such license issued in the county. When Stough moved to Crawford County he had his license recorded there with its original date of issuance. Cf. *Crawford County Marriage Record Book,* No. 1, following item 46.

44 *Marriage Record Book of Columbiana County,* Vol. I, p. 19.

other was to find Ohio men with the desired aptitudes and zeal and to train them for the work.

In the first instance Stough could call the attention of the Ministerium to the needs of the West, requesting that preachers be sent on tour as a beginning attack on the problem. When churches were sufficiently developed the next step would be to secure settled pastors. Likely Stough had the hope that a touring pastor would be so impressed by the needs and possibilities of the area that he would be willing to settle there.

This is exactly what happened in the case of Wilhelm Forster, whom the Ministerium in 1805 commissioned to tour Ohio and who returned the following year to take up his residence in Perry County. Stough gave Forster a list of names of settlers to induce him to decide to move to Ohio. Forster's career in Ohio was cut short by his death in 1815. His badly neglected grave is on a farm midway between Thornville and Somerset.

A similar case is that of Paul Henkel. He made missionary tours in the state in 1806 and later, and about 1812 settled at Point Pleasant, W. Va.[45] Both he and Forster were ordained pastors. Another man, Andrew Simon, at Stough's request was made a licensed candidate and sent as traveling preacher in northeastern Ohio and adjacent areas in Pennsylvania in 1808.[46] He later settled in the Big Miami River area.

Stough's greatest success was in inducing men in his congregations to become preachers. His procedure was to get the man's consent, next to have a parish accept him, and then to present petitions for a license from both the man and the parish to the Ministerium. The first instance was in 1804 when Columbiana County congregations requested favorable action for George Simon.[47] This was granted, but unfortunately Mr. Simon died within a year. In 1809 Henry Weygandt, from Stough's congregation in Washington County, Pa., was licensed as a catechist to study under the latter's supervision.[48] Weygandt was pastor in Washington County for twenty years and spent the rest of his ministry in Wayne County, Ohio. He died in 1847.

45 "Paul Henkel's Journal," edited by C. L. Martzolff and F. E. Cooper, *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly,* Vol. XXIII, pp. 162-218. See also B. H. Pershing, "Paul Henkel, Frontier Missionary, Organizer, and Author," *Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Vol. VII, pp. 125 ff.

46 *Documentary History,* pp. 391, 395.

47 *Ibid.,* pp. 343, 347.

48 *Ibid.,* p. 407.

The next year Stough had another name to propose—that of Anthony Weyer, who, however, was not accepted by the Ministerium that year. Stough's big year, so far as new pastors were concerned, was 1812. It was then that the Ministerium granted licenses to four men for service in Ohio. One of them was John Rinehard, of Jefferson County, mentioned earlier as a parishioner whom Stough had followed to Ohio. He became pastor of his home congregation at Osage and of others in the vicinity. After 1825 he relinquished his ministerial duties, apparently to devote all his time to farming. He died in 1861 and was buried in the cemetery of Good Hope Church. A second man was Henry Hewitt (Huett), to whom Stough had ministered in Pennsylvania. Hewitt became pastor in the Youngstown area and across the state line in Pennsylvania. After his death in 1855 he was buried in the Bethlehem Church cemetery. The third man was Anthony Weyer, who finally was granted a license for Belmont County, though most of his ministry was spent in Canton until his death in 1829. The fourth man, Jacob Leist (1788-1870), who settled in the area between Lancaster and Circleville, seems to have had no connection with Stough.

Besides these, Stough in 1815 recommended Abraham Schneider, who became pastor at New Philadelphia. Moreover, Stough joined with others in 1813 in a request to the Ministerium that a license be restored to Samuel Mau, who had ministered to Lutherans at one time but had defected for a while to the followers of F. W. Otterbein and now wished to be a Lutheran pastor again.

From this recital it is apparent that Stough was gathering about him some colleagues in the ministry, most of whom were active Christians because of his ministry and were pastors supervised by him in their preparation for ordination. It would be expected that they would look up to him as a leader whose spirit and ideals they would accept in large measure.

The next step therefore was the formation of an organization. All of these men had received their ministerial certification—either licensure or ordination—from the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. Because of its geographical spread that synodical body provided for district organizations within the general structure. Taking advantage of this provision when there were enough men to do so, Stough and his colleagues held their first convention as a Western Conference on

October 17, 1812, in Washington County, Pa. The record lists no officers, but Stough was clearly the leader. His name appears first in the roll of pastors; he preached the first sermon, and at the end of the convention he "addressed solemn and serious closing words to his brethren."[49] At the next convention he quite clearly was president, as was also the case at the third, the sixth, and the seventh conventions.

Under the conference arrangement it was necessary for ministerial candidates to make the long trip to the East for licenses or ordination. The desire soon arose that this authority to license or ordain might be granted to the Western Conference. In 1817 Stough returned to the scenes of his boyhood to attend the Ministerium convention at York and to present the request from his Conference. He found that the Ministerium desired to retain control of ordinations but was willing to give the right of licensure to the Conference. Those were the best terms Stough could get, and they were not satisfactory to the men in Ohio. Stough and Paul Henkel favored accepting the compromise terms, but the younger men who had no strong ties with the East were strongly for independence and induced the older pastors to agree.

The result was the first convention of the Ohio Synod at Somerset in 1818. Here again Stough was elected president. He was fifty-six years old. He had been preaching for twenty-seven years, twenty-five of them with license—a longer time than any of the others. He had their respect. They re-elected him president in 1819, 1820, 1822, 1824, and 1828. At the age of sixty-six he was complaining of the infirmities of age, so that he was not again elected to office.

During the years he was president the Synod was struggling to make a beginning in several aspects of its work. At the outset there was an attempt at founding an educational institution. This failed. It was not until 1830 when Stough had retired that a successful beginning was made which ultimately became Capital University and Theological Seminary. As for parish education, the Synod urged the pastors to establish Sunday schools. In doctrinal matters it authorized the preparation of a statement of the Lutheran position on the sacraments. Its missionary zeal was indicated by its plan of traveling preachers. Such was the business of the conventions over which Stough presided. So began the synod, later known as the Joint Synod of Ohio,

49 *Minutes of the Special Conference*, 1812, p. 2.

which in 1930 merged with two other synods to form the American Lutheran Church.

In 1828 Stough was thinking of retiring from active ministerial service. By the end of the year he was closing his pastoral duties. At the end of the winter he had sold his farm in Columbiana County. With the beginning of spring he was in possession of the farm in Crawford County. But even in retirement his pastoral services were in demand. His first recorded marriage in the county was that of Adam Shoemaker and Catharine Staffer on September 30, 1832. He preached in New Washington and St. John's churches in the county. He assisted Pastor Francis J. Ruth of Bucyrus in his work over a considerable area, as, for example, in a communion service on Christmas Day, 1833, in Mt. Zion Church east of Lucas. He even undertook a missionary tour authorized by the synod, reporting to the 1830 convention that he was three months on tour, that he had preached 39 times, baptized 41 children, confirmed 4, administered the Lord's Supper to 104 communicants, and collected $3.75. The treasurer was directed to pay him $75 for his work.[50]

The Ohio Synod was growing at such a rate that in 1831 it subdivided into an Eastern and a Western District. In 1836 an English District was formed. But tensions were arising over doctrine, language, and practice, so that in 1840 the majority of the English District declared itself an English Lutheran Synod independent of the Joint Synod. Stough chose to affiliate with this new synod. The minutes of its 1841 convention read: "Resolved, That the venerable Father Stough be received as a member of this body. Further Resolved, That he be hereby elected Senior of this Ministerium. The scene that here followed was solemn and impressive, the first apostle of Lutheranism in Ohio after a long life of usefulness in the ministry speaking to his brethren of another generation as from the grave in reference to their arduous and responsible duties. Closed with prayers by the Rev. Father Stough."[51]

The office of "Senior" was largely honorary. It was understood that "the Ministerium shall honor the Senior as a father and willingly receive from him counsel, admonition, and reproof in those cases in

50 *Minutes*, 1830, p. 3.
51 *Minutes of the English Ohio Synod*, 1841, pp. 22 f.

which his experience can be serviceable to others."[52] There were but few years left for him to function in this capacity. Infirmities interfered with his attendance at conventions. Yet in 1844 he was present at Wooster when the English Synod was debating the question of the location of a "literary and theological" institution to be established with the name "Wittenberg College." Since most of the pastors of the synod lived in the northeastern part of the state they preferred Wooster as the site. The professor-elect, Ezra Keller, urged a location farther southwest, keeping in mind the expansion of the church in the Ohio Valley and in Indiana. It was the voice of the Senior that tipped the scales. As Keller wrote in his journal, "At this point of the discussion, Father Stough, the senior member of the ministerium, arose, supporting himself with his staff (now eighty-three years old), and tenderly admonished the Synod to weigh well the arguments advanced in favor of a removal, and not to act unadvisedly. This remark had a thrilling effect and melted many to tears."[53]

Stough's separation from the parent synod of which he was six times president calls attention to the problems faced by the youthful synod. These problems were interrelated. The answers tended to cluster in two groupings. One problem was the use of English in the worship of the congregations. Another was the introduction of revivals or semi-revivalistic practices into the parishes, such practices being usually called "new measures." A third problem was the distinctiveness with which Lutheran doctrine was to be defined and preached. Since *The Lutheran Observer*, published in the East, ardently espoused English, new measures, and a modified Lutheranism, subscription to that paper was often the mark of a man's sympathies.

The Joint Synod tried to hold within its organization all Lutherans in Ohio. Though it was predominantly German, it willingly included English sermons in its convention programs, it published its proceedings in English as well as in German, and it published its paper, *The Lutheran Standard*, in English. It was definitely not Anglophobe. Though it was decidedly cool toward revivals and passed a resolution in 1832 against "new measures," there is no record that any disciplinary action was taken against such pastors as used them. The Joint Synod definitely preferred Lutheran doctrine, but it was only in

52 A. H. Smith, *A History of the East Ohio Synod* (Columbus, 1924), p. 15.
53 Quoted in M. Diehl, *Biography of Rev. Ezra Keller, D.D.* (Springfield, 1859), p. 252.

the last years of Stough's life that the synod was expressing vigorous confessionalism.

Thus there arose within the synod a little group of pastors who (1) were energetically "new measure" men, or (2) were eager for the change to English, or (3) preferred a Lutheranism very broadly defined—one, two, or all three attitudes being expressed by a given pastor. At the other extreme were men bitterly opposed to "new measures," intransigent in their determination to retain the German language, and strictly confessional in theology. The outcome was that both groups withdrew from the Joint Synod, the one to form the English Synod, the other to participate in organizing the Missouri Synod.

On the matter of language, John Stough had no hostility to English, though it cannot be said that he preferred it. He could and did preach in English on occasions, as, for example, at the 1815 convention of the Conference.[54] But he usually left the English sermon to the younger men who likely were more fluent in that language than he. His colleague in Crawford County, F. J. Ruth, wrote, "I became acquainted with the Rev. John Stough, a German Lutheran minister resided a few miles distant from Bucyrus. This aged brother frequently assisted me on sacramental occasions in my charge until near his death which occurred in A. D. 1845."[55] This assisting evidently was in English. Stough wrote his autobiography in German. "The Galton Evangelical Lutheran Church was organized by Rev. Father Stough in A. D. 1831, and he preached for the congregation for several years in the German language."[56] The prevailing impression, therefore, is that his speech was German.

There can be no doubt about his preference for "new measures." In the obituary concerning him F. J. Ruth said, "Prayer meetings, protracted efforts, etc., when scripturally conducted, were feasts to his soul."[57] In 1838 Stough wrote to the editor of *The Lutheran Observer* that he had "read the Observer with great pleasure for several years. . . . Whatever even approximates true heart religion or experimental piety affords me great pleasure."[58] He was aware that he used methods not approved by some of his brethren. He wrote,

54 *Minutes*, p. 23.
55 *The Life and Work of Rev. Francis Jacob Ruth* (Plymouth, O., 1888), pp. 44 f.
56 *Ibid.*, p. 85.
57 *The Lutheran Observer*, August 15, 1845, p. 3.
58 *Ibid.*, November 9, 1838, p. 2.

"Lutherans also opposed the measures I used in my churches. I often appointed meetings in private houses for exhortation, prayer, and religious conference. . . . Notwithstanding the ridicule and persecution which these meetings have met with, not only from our lay members but from many accomplished clergy who uniformly gave their influence against them, I nevertheless feel it my duty to recommend them most seriously and pressingly to the favorable notice of our churches and ministers."[59] Yet the Joint Synod had no intention of excluding him from its membership. Somehow the rumor got out that it had done so and an inquiry was addressed to the synod. The Minutes read: "Several members of a church council of a congregation in Whetstone Township, Crawford County, request the Synod to inform them whether Pastor Stauch is yet on favorable terms with the Synod. . . . Resolved, That this congregation be informed that Father Stauch is still a member of this body; that the Synod in Zanesville did not impeach his character, nor that this Synod has any grounds to fault his conduct."[60] Separation from the Joint Synod five years later was his own act, not that of the Synod.

In the absence of specific evidence concerning his doctrine, his theological views must be arrived at by inference. All indications are that his position was pietistic and therefore more likely to be moderate than strict in doctrine. He wrote, "My principal books for fifty years have been Starke's Commentary, Spener's Explanation of Luther's Five Principles, my catechism, hymn book, and the Holy Bible."[61] Neither Starke nor Spener represented a position vigorously dogmatic in doctrine. In none of Stough's writings that have survived is there any mention of the Augsburg Confession or of the other confessions of the Lutheran Church. Conduct, not doctrine, was the matter of first consideration with him. Conduct meant for him total abstinence instead of drunkenness, clean speech instead of cursing, and Sabbath observance instead of hunting and games on Sunday.[62]

The English Synod best represented Stough's interests. Because it adjusted its practices to those of Protestantism in general, Stough felt that the future was on its side. Revivalistic practices and Puritan

59 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 30 f.
60 *Minutes*, 1836, pp. 8 f.
61 Sheatsley, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
62 *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 29 f.

morals seemed to him to hold the greatest promise, and to be the truest expression of the Gospel. The Joint Synod of Ohio, from which he withdrew, believed otherwise and proceeded to demonstrate the vitality of its views by vigorous growth and expansion. The English Synod and others of its kind that arose experienced large growth also. On both sides there was a deep appreciation of Stough—on the one side for his indefatigable pioneering and early leadership, on the other side for his earnest evangelism and impressive piety.

The problem which Stough faced unconsciously and therefore uncritically was that of the adjustment of an American church to the American mid-west. As a second-generation German in America he had an imperfect understanding and appreciation of the church in Germany. Being American-born and a frontiersman he had something of the sympathies and mental outlook of his compatriots, even though he expressed his views in German. Without being clearly aware of the implications of his position, he was in effect affirming that Lutheranism in Ohio to be true to its mission must adopt the methods of its Protestant neighbors. Lutheranism in Ohio, having completed its Americanization, thinks otherwise.

The Diaries of John Stough, 1806-1807

By Theodore G. Tappert

THE importance which ministers ascribed to the keeping of diaries in the eighteenth century is well known. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Lutheran ministers in America should have been required to preserve day-by-day accounts of their experiences and official acts. John Nicholas Kurtz, the first man ordained (1748) by what came to be called the Ministerium of North America, had to pledge "to keep a diary and journal and enter therein my official acts and all notable incidents."[1] The constitution of the said body which was in force in 1781 stipulated that "licensed candidates must carefully record their official acts in a diary which is to be submitted to each meeting of the synod." Such diaries served not only the purpose of a circumstantial report of a year's activity but also provided material for an "edifying conversation" when the ministers assembled for their annual meeting.[2] Similar requirements were made throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century and in the early decades of the nineteenth.

When John Stough (Stauch) was licensed in 1793 to preach on the western frontier he was naturally expected to keep and submit diaries. This was not less true when he was appointed to serve as a traveling preacher. The minutes of the 1807 convention of the Ministerium report: "A part of the journal handed in by Preacher Stauch was read. It appears from it that he traveled 1,300 miles, preached 67 times, baptized 212 children, and received on this journey $42.98. He traveled about 122 days, and in consideration of this the synodical treasury owes Mr. Stauch the sum of $162.67."[3] A comparison of this minute with the diaries reproduced in translation below will identify the diaries as the ones from which a portion was read.

From Washington County, Pennsylvania, Stough struck out in various directions to visit settlements in western Pennsylvania and the

1 *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1748-1821* (Philadelphia, 1898), p. 21.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 175; cf. p. 174.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 380

present West Virginia as well as Ohio. His entries are not so revealing as one might wish. However ready he may have been in speech, the diaries reveal that he wrote laboriously. His spelling is phonetic and often inconsistent, betraying his want of schooling. His handwriting is cramped, and it is often hard to decipher, partly because he uses many abbreviations. Place names are reproduced as he heard them, and some of these were unraveled only with help from Professor Allbeck, who is more familiar with the region than the translator is. The diaries, which are the only ones known to be extant, are here reproduced in full from the original manuscript deposited in the archives of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, located in the library of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia.

Translation of the Diaries

Extract from my diaries as traveling preacher. As far as I can observe, many receive with warm thanks the efforts that are made to prepare them for the Gospel, but others are indifferent. As traveling preacher I have preached in ten counties, in some places once and in others three or four times.

June 18 [1806]. After prayer with my family I set out on my journey. On the way read the first eight chapters of Matthew. How great is the goodness of God, in faithfulness and teaching, toward wretched man! Rode twenty miles. Put up for the night with praying people. [Received] 100 cents.

June 19. When I awoke, I sighed in my heart, gave thanks to God, and prayed for divine help to accomplish what I have to do. Rode nineteen miles. Preached on Luke 15:10. Stayed overnight with people who pray for the kingdom of Jesus.

June 20. Reached Stuben [Steubenville, Ohio], a distance of twenty-five miles. Visited two sick men, one of whom was in an awakened condition. 160 cents.

June 21. Preached on Matt. 10:6, 7. Baptized a child. Some ten families live here. Some expressed hearty thanks for the Gospel. Rode sixteen miles. Put up for the night where I discovered through conversation and prayer that the family prefers to be pious rather than ungodly.

June 22. Preached twice on Luke 15:1-10. Appeal to all sinners: "Jesus accepts you. Come soon. Come all. Come repentant. Allow yourselves to be cleansed of your sins." Baptized eighteen children. There are about thirty families here, and in the other place about twenty-five. Almost all the people are quite unknown to me. I saw attentive faces and moist eyes. God grant that I may be able to know some of them as blessed. 250 cents.

June 23. Journeyed toward Geffeson [Jefferson?], in Columbiana County, a distance of thirty miles.

June 24. Visited four families, members of which I confirmed years ago. We wept for joy. O Jesus, thy powerful Word! Go into all the world, etc.

June 25. Preached on Mark 10:17. Baptized six children. Ten families. God, there is more chaff than wheat! 78 centts.

June 26. Spent the day pleasantly with my children and several neighbors.

June 27. Rode six miles. Assembled fifteen people and spent a couple of hours with them in prayer and exhortation.

June 28. Rode twelve miles to a place where some ninety Germans are living. Preached on John 7:37. Everybody there was unknown to me. Observed thoughtful faces. Baptized three children.Rode on for another twelve miles. 228 cents.

June 29. Preached twice on March 6:36-42. Two church buildings have been started here, seven miles apart. I baptized seventeen children. My soul rejoices over the fact that in one place where there was wilderness six years ago, two hundred people now assemble. Some manifest a heart warm toward religion. Some invited me to go with them. What a promise it is: Whoever gives you a cup of water to drink, etc. Here I received a call. 38 cents.

June 30. Fourteen miles. Preached on Heb. 4:16. Fifteen families. Baptized two children. Biwer [Beaver] County, Pennsylvania. Rode nineteen miles.

July 1. Stayed overnight with an acquaintance. Baptized one child. Rode two miles to the home of a sick woman. Baptized a child. Rode thirty-two miles through a region in which I know no German to be living.

July 2. Rode twenty-six miles, visited six families.

July 3. Rode twenty miles. Happened to fall into the company of a man who said that he had been lost to sight for sixty years. He spoke about God, his family, and himself in a nice way. Returned home. [On this whole journey] I preached 9 times, traveled 266 miles, received $8.64.

September 1. When I awoke I lifted up my heart in prayer: God make me useful to many souls. Several of my neighbors came to my home to pray, and I committed us all to the good God. Entered upon my second journey. Five people accompanied me for four days. Rode twelve miles. Preached on the seventh petition in Matt. 6. Baptized three children. Grin [Greene] County. Put up for the night with a praying family. Mannangahali [Monongalia] County, Virginia. Rode thirteen miles. 15 cents.

September 2. Preached on Luke 5:32. A completely helpless man desired prayer. Rode twelve miles.

September 3. Preached on John 19:34. Gave the Lord's Supper to eleven awakened people inasmuch as there was evidence that the Word was not without power. Baptized a child. Rode twelve miles. 168 cents.

September 4. Visited a sick man who knows Jesus. Rode sixteen miles.

September 5. Preached on John 17:3. Baptized twelve children. There are six families in the mountains. Six persons accompanied me for ten miles. 97 cents.

September 6. Preached on Ps. 39:5. Baptized eleven children. Ten families. Ohio County, Virginia.

September 7. Journeyed thirty-two miles to Belmaund [Belmont] County in Ohio.

September 8. Preached on Luke 17:11-19. God be merciful to a people living in security. Twenty-five families. Baptized six children. Rode twelve miles.

September 9. Preached on James 1:22. There are some who believe that one must be converted in order to be saved. Baptized six children. Rode fifteen miles in Geffurson [Jefferson] County. An innkeeper in Cates [Cadiz?], who is an adherent of no religion, accepted nothing for fodder. May God, who gave him a heart to give, also give him a heart to receive the grace which makes godly. Rode eight miles.

September 10. Preached on John 14:22. Baptized seven children. God grant that his kingdom may grow. Rode nine miles. 56 cents.

September 11. Preached on Ps. 1:1, 2. Baptized six children. Rode six miles. 122 cents.

September 12. Preached on II Peter 3:10, 11. Baptized two children. Attentive hearers. Put up for the night at the home of a praying man. Rode ten miles. 116 cents.

September 13. Preached on I Tim. 1:15. Baptized six children. There are people here who wish to be saved. 200 cents.

September 14. Rode thirty miles to Columbiana County.

September 15. Preached on Matt. 6:33. Baptized two brothers. Rode ten miles.

September 16. Visited several families. Rode sixteen miles.

September 17. Several praying families. Had an exhortation. Rode six miles.

September 18. Preached on John 3:36. Many auditors, but few with understanding. 120 cents.

September 19. Rode twenty-three miles.

September 20. Preached on Matt. 6:17. Baptized seven children. 232 cents.

September 21. Visited several awakened families. Rode fifteen miles.

September 22. Preached on Phil. 2:5. Baptized one child. Rode ten miles.

September 23. Preached on Luke 7:11-17. Baptized twelve children. Rode fifteen miles. 186 cents.

September 24. Preached on Eph. 3:19. Baptized four children. Rode eleven miles. In the evening I thanked God with joy and anxiety that on this journey I had preached in eighteen places. God grant that it was not in vain. Biwer [Beaver] County, Pensil[vania].

September 25. Visited one family. Rode seventeen miles.

September 27. Preached on Matt. 5:3 in German and English.

September 28. Rode eighteen miles.

September 29. Preached on John 15:12-14. Baptized nine children. Rode twelve miles.

September 30. Preached on Phil. 1:27. Rode fourteen miles.

October 1. Preached on Phil. 1:29. 118 cents.

October 2. Rode twenty-eight miles. [Totals for the whole journey:] Baptized 93, preached 21 times, traveled 416 miles, received $11.50.

November 20. Entered upon my third journey. Rode eighteen miles.

November 21. Preached on Matt. 10:7-10. Baptized six children. Rode fourteen miles.

November 22. Preached. O man, what is the condition of thy heart? Eighteen miles.

November 23. Preached on Matt. 26:15-22. Rode six miles. 180 cents.

November 24. Visited a German family. Rode ten miles.

November 25. Preached on Luke 17:33, to about thirty people. Biwer [Beaver] County, in Pennsylvania. There were people who knew that they have souls to care for, and many wept silently. Baptized three children. God grant that the little spark may grow. 100 cents.

November 26. Across the great line and up the Shinango [Shenango River] in Merser County [Mercer County, Pennsylvania] for twenty-six miles. Good Shepherd, lead me into the right way, among people into whose heart thy Word may find entrance. May the great waters not deter me, even as thou hast now kept me going without hindrance for twelve years.

November 27. Waited here. Had the people come together, word being sent out in advance for a distance of ten miles.

November 28. Preached on Eccl. 12:12, 13. Baptized nine children. Twenty people. Rode ten miles.

November 29. Preached on John 7:46 to fifteen people who told me with tears that many of them have already lived there for six years without hearing a single German sermon. Baptized two children. The people assembled again in the evening, and although I was caught in a very heavy rain, I preached to them again. 125 cents.

November 30. Preached on John 3:16. There were many children to baptize. Nobody had the heart to tell me, and I did not learn of it until evening. Rode fifteen miles.

December 1. Rode thirteen miles.

December 2. Visited a lame woman. O God, when will wolves assume the nature of lambs?

December 3. Preached on John 5:5, 6. Rode six miles.

December 4. Preached on Ps. 1:1, 2 to twenty people. Rode four miles.

December 5. Visited a family. Rode twenty miles.

December 6. Found three German families that know of Jesus. Rode eight miles. 80 cents.

December 7. Preached on Ps. 25:11 to ten families. Rode sixteen miles. Baptized one child.

December 8. Visited several families. Rode twenty miles.

December 10. Preached on Luke 21:36.

December 11. Arrived at home. All together I preached 12 times, baptized 22, received $6.85, traveled 198 miles. God bless the little that I have done with thy great and everlasting blessing. Amen.

December 28. My fourth journey begins. Preached on Isa. 3. Rode ten miles.

December 29. Visited several families, spoke with them, prayed with them, and discussed especially the question whether faith follows feeling, or feeling follows faith.

December 31. The sun went down red on this cold evening before I completed my twenty miles. O God, will the sun shine next year over our land in peace or in strife, and will our land be more godly than last year?

January 1, 1807. Preached on Eph. 4:22-24. Rode two miles. Spent two nights with praying people. 200 cents.

January 3. Preached on Col. 3:9, 10. Fifteen families. Rode eight miles. 117 cents.

January 4. Preached on John 3:16. Baptized six children. There are people here who wish to go to heaven, but few who wish to become pious. Rode six miles.

January 5. Rode eighteen miles without seeing a house. Visited two old people. The old woman was hard of hearing, came close to me during my prayer in order to hear. She loves Jesus.

January 6. Today it became clear to me that we gullible people who wish to go to heaven are often led by a higher power to take a poor path. At the end of twenty miles of a swampy and dark road I found five German families. Two were very happy. Baptized a child of one of these near Miskingum [Muskingum?].

January 7. Visited a man with whom I was acquainted. Baptized a child of his. Rode twenty miles toward Kenton [Canton] on the Dusgavabe Plain [?].

January 8. Preached on Jude 17 to sixteen people. Baptized one child. O God, when will thy patience be exhausted, and when will all people know thee? 129 cents.

January 9. Rode twenty miles through a thick forest and progressed only ten miles. Toward evening arrived safely in the moss-covered woods at the dwelling of a German, one of whose children I baptized. Good Shepherd, help the scattered sheep!

January 10. Rode ten miles to an awakened family.

January 11. Preached on Mark 10:17. Baptized a child. Rode twelve miles.

January 12. Rode twelve miles to my family. There had my clothes mended while I improved my mind with reading on January 13.

January 14. I turned northward for eighteen miles to visit several families.

January 15. Spoke with an old man who knows a great deal but has not yet found himself. Rode ten miles.

January 16, 17. Preached on John 5:39 to about thirty people. Rode twelve miles in Trombul [Trumbull] County. 35 cents.

January 18. Preached on John 2:1-11 to fourteen people. Rode six miles.

January 19. Preached on John 2:8, 9. Baptized a child.

January 20. Visited a German school with twenty children.

January 21. Rode fourteen miles in Biwer [Beaver] County, Pennsylvania. Visited a sick woman who was anxious to have consolation; found her on her knees in prayer.

January 22. Visited a German school with thirty children. Rode twelve miles.

January 24. Preached on Matt. 20:6, 7. Baptized a child. [On this journey] I baptized 13 children, preached 10 times, traveled 218 miles, received $6.81.

February 21, 1807. My fifth journey begins. Rode fifteen miles.

February 22. Preached on I Tim. 1:15, 16. Baptized five children. Rode nine miles.

February 24. Preached on Matt. 4:1-11. Baptized a child.

February 25. Rode nine miles.

February 26. Preached on John 5:39.

February 27. Traveled twenty miles in Geffurson [Jefferson] County.

February 28. Preached on I Tim. 2:16. Very heavy rain. Rode fifteen miles.

March 1. Preached on Luke 22:24. Baptized five children. Rode twelve miles. 126 cents.

March 2. Preached on I Cor. 15:55. Baptized two children. Visited a sick family. Rode eight miles.

March 3. Preached on I Peter 1:18, 19 to forty people. Struck several in their hearts. Baptized three children. Rode eight miles.

March 4. Rode sixteen miles in Belmaund [Belmont] County.

March 5. Preached on Mark 2:6 to twenty-five people. Baptized six children. Rode eighteen miles. 187 cents.

March 6. Traveled twenty-six miles through a region in which I know of no German people. In the evening arrived at the home of a German family that rejoiced in prayer.

March 7. Rode thirty miles. Visited one family.

March 8. Preached on John 7:40. Baptized a child. Rode fourteen miles. 123 cents.

March 9. Preached on Prov. 14:32. Baptized four children. Rode four miles.

March 10. Preached on I Tim. 2:4. Baptized a child. Rode fifteen miles. 85 cents.

March 11. Preached on Prov. 28:23. Baptized six children. Rode ten miles.

March 12. Preached on Rom. 5:8. Baptized one child. 125 cents.

March 13. Rode twelve miles.

March 14. Preached. Much is required of him who knows much.

March 15. Rode twenty miles in Ohio County, Virginia.

March 16. Preached on John 8:51. Baptized two children. Rode nine miles.

March 17. Preached on Luke 23:27-31. [On this journey] I baptized 35, preached 15 times, traveled 225 miles, and received $6.47.

If I have in my haste counted aright, I traveled in all 122 days, preached 67 times, baptized 212 children, covered 1301 miles, and received $28.27.

I have forgotten how much I gathered last fall in my old congregations for the travel [?] fund. I sent the amount to the officers of the Ministerium. I believe that it was between $20 and $25.

JOHANNES STAUCH

Effects of Mobility of Population

By Walter Wietzke

A CURRENT cliché has it that "ministers no longer preach to congregations but to a passing parade!" Most parish ministers would gladly corroborate this observation. Just recently I wrote to a pastor in Nebraska for the transfer of a young couple who were to be received into the membership of our congregation. The Friday before the Sunday on which this was to take place the man informed me that his company was shifting him to Ohio. To this day, I wonder what the pastor in Omaha thought when his transfer for people to Detroit finally came back from Cincinnati.

The rate of mobility is not always obvious to the casual viewer, but for anyone who is involved in group work, or peruses basic statistical tables, the facts are plain. In urban situations there is nothing unique in taking in seventy-five new members in the course of a year and transferring seventy-five others. Governmental listings indicate that twenty per cent of the population has been on the move during the past decade, and that means thirty million people have been engaged in the moving process each year. It is staggering to the imagination to contemplate what this will mean by 1975 when there will be 228 million people in the United States, or by the year 2000 when the projected population total indicates that there will be in excess of 336 million persons.

This shifting population has had astonishing effects on the life of the church. Some have been quite salutary. Congregations and denominations have tended to lose their parochial attitudes, there has been an increased emphasis on evangelism, new creative thrusts have been forthcoming theologically, socially, and even architecturally. There have been others not so salutary, and it is these we would do well to examine.

The first of these effects, or defects, is that mobility has tended to make religion individual rather than communal. It is no accident that the contemplative religions of the East are finding a foothold in the traditionally Christian West. Our sense of community has been given a vicious blow by the phenomenon of mobility, and modern man with his inbred spiritual shallowness has not been able fruitfully to relate his basically communal faith to the demands of a state of social flux. Hence his retreat into individualism. His lack of perception does not permit him to evaluate the distinctive concepts of his faith, or those from the East, and he wallows under the presupposition that "all religions are trying to say the same thing." One of the professors at Wayne State University described it in this way: "The religions of the East are making new inroads in the West. We do not even understand that B'hai is simply Hinduism dressed up for Detroiters."

The actual circumstance of mobility frequently follows this pattern: A man's

employer tells him he is to be sent into a new area. He arrives not knowing how long he is to stay. Under these circumstances he is reluctant to take his membership away from his home church. There is always the possibility of return. Yet he does not, and cannot, function as a member of the home congregation. Perhaps in his new circumstance he finds a congregation which interests him and takes an interest in him, and he decides even in the light of his temporary situation to transfer. More often he does not. Anticipating that he will move again, he hesitates to make abiding relationships, and it is precisely at this point that the temptation arises for him to retreat into a philosophy of individualism until "things are straightened around." The tragedy is that this becomes the enduring circumstance; the man is lost to the life of the church, and the strength of the church is lost to him.

Now, it seems to me that each Christian ought to be impressed beyond question that the nature of the Christian faith is basically communal. We believe in "the community of believers." This is our confession, "I believe in the holy Christian church, the communion of saints." Since this body of believers is not limited to one city or circumstance, it is actually one of the high privileges of the Christian faith to share both life and faith with new people in new congregations. Inasmuch as it is an easy thing to write a transfer, people would do well to identify themselves with a church and a community as soon as they enter it, even if their roots in that church and community will be torn up once again. In this way, at least some contact is maintained with the "soil" in which the Christian personality must grow. Otherwise men become like plants merely lying on the surface of the ground.

The second effect, or defect, of mobility is that it tends to make people emphasize feelings rather than doctrine and teaching. Feelings are very important. If one reads the Epistles of the New Testament, it is quite obvious that feelings have a high place in life, and in the life of the church. Time and again St. Paul expresses his joy over the way in which he was received, or indignation that after his departure things have taken a turn for the worse. The congregations of our day have to be concerned with the feelings of people. It is important that they be treated kindly, welcomed warmheartedly, with real concern. But this matter of feelings has become pathological with vast numbers of people. In fact, many choose a congregation not according to the truth it teaches or the doctrines it holds but according to the warmness of the reception they are given.

Admittedly, we should be genuinely hospitable, but in all frankness pastors get sick and tired of hearing about "how cold their church is." It is sinful to come to a church service to see how warm people will be toward me. This is the height (or depth) of religious self-centeredness. Once in a while the pastor wishes they would come to be warmed by the Spirit of God.

It is not a healthy spirit that has to be fawned over in order to respond. The diffident accusation of "cold churches" is by and large a miserable and phoney generalization made by apostles of discord, men who are more concerned about self-recognition than about real Christian fellowship. The truth of the matter is

that my attitude pretty much determines the attitude of others toward me, and (whether good or bad) this is involuntarily communicated. How sad a sight is the man who sullenly sits in a corner waiting for someone to befriend him, who almost defies him to do it! Most people do not go that far, yet "feelings" remain supreme.

The consequence of this is that the whole teaching side of the church is made secondary. Certainly evangelism is more than having a pair of gregarious greeters at the door. What a church teaches should be as important as the handshakes it has to offer. Perhaps if people were more concerned about what the church teaches regarding God, man, sin, and grace, and see how it applies to them, they themselves would be better equipped to be involved in and foster better human relationships. Candid Dorothy Sayers has exposed some of the foibles of our modern religiosity in this "Open Letter."

> The only letter I ever want to address to average people is one that says: "Why don't you take the trouble to find out what is Christianity and what isn't? Why, when you can bestir yourselves to learn technical terms about electricity, won't you do as much for theology before you begin to argue about it? Why do you never read either the ancient or the modern authorities in the subject but take your information, for the most part, from biologists and physicists who have picked it up as inaccurately as yourselves? Why do you accept mildewed old heresies as bold and constructive contributions to modern Christian thought when any handbook on church history would tell you where they came from? Why do you complain that the proposition God is three in one is obscure and mystical and yet acquiesce meekly in the physicist's fundamental formula "two P minus PQ equals IH over two Pi where 1 equals the square root of minus 1" when you know quite well that the square root of minus 1 is paradoxical and Pi is incalculable. What makes you suppose that the expression "God ordains" is narrow and bigoted whereas the expressions "nature provides" or "science demands" are objective statements of fact? You would be ashamed to know as little about internal combustion as you do about beliefs. I admit that you can practice Christianity without knowing much about theology, just as you can drive a car without understanding internal combustion. But if something breaks down in the car, you go humbly to the man who understands the works whereas if something goes wrong with religion you merely throw the creed away and tell the theologian he is a liar. Why do you want a letter from me telling you about God? You will never bother to check up on it and find out whether I am giving you a personal opinion or the church's doctrine. Go away and do some work and let me get on with mine.
>
> "Yours very sincerely, DOROTHY L. SAYERS."[1]

Many persons with tender feelings can protest the brusqueness of the reply, but none can deny the fact that she has exposed one of the deceits and failures of modern Christians, viz., "the lack of desire really to know what the Christian faith is all about."

A third defect that has emerged in the life of the church is that mobility tends to glorify the pastor instead of the pastor's Christ. Our uprooted people have learned to "shop around." Not only are they looking for warmth, but they are looking for a leader who will meet their ideals. And what is their ideal other than a "pastor image" recreated from childhood or a subconscious desire to find some high priest who will sanctify the illusions and predatory self-interests that

1 Gerald Kennedy, *A Reader's Notebook* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), p. 135, citing Dorothy L. Sayers, *Current Religious Thought.*

govern their lives? This is salutary in that it keeps preachers on their toes. It is evil in that it idolizes the individual and subsumes the Gospel under the personality of the preacher. What people do not consider is that every man is a man—and often at the peak of human popularity and the people's praise, he is found to have "clay legs." What happens then to those whose glory was in him, and not in Christ?

Nonetheless, pastors have become the objects of scrutiny. High premium is put on a man's ability to articulate and communicate, how he looks, how much hair he has on his head, almost everything but the thing it should be on: the pastor's Christ and the people's Christ.

Luther once remarked about Justus Jones that "he was a good preacher and a good pastor," but, he said, "the people will not hear him because he hums and spits." Personal idiosyncrasies made him a failure. Similarly, pastors today are pressured by public opinion. We would do well to give up many of our idiosyncrasies, but in the final analysis one cannot adapt all actions and convictions to suit the fancy of men. The compulsion toward this conformity is the death of faith's creativeness.

But it is not lack of esteem for the pastor that proves the modern stumbling block. It is rather that in their devotedness to him people often fail in their devotedness to Christ. Shortly before he died, S. Parks Cadman said to one of his colleagues, "Fred, my church is slipping and my men won't do anything about it. Do you know what is wrong with my church? My people like me, but they don't love God."[2] This is what is listed on most casualty reports. They love us, but not the Lord.

We should understand that mobility in itself does not mean that these things have to occur: making religion individual, putting feelings first, idolizing the clergy. I suppose they are only heightened by present insecurity. But these are some of the things happening "in the parade," and no good watchman on the walls of Zion can serve effectively if he is blinded by the praise of self, seduced by this matter of "feelings," or undisturbed as people wallow in the slough of religious individualism.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 40, citing Frederick Keller Stamm, *If This Be Religion.*

Irenaeus and the Valentinians

By Otto Reimherr

UNTIL recent years only fragmentary information concerning the Valentinians was available. Their system could be only partly pieced together from the remnants to be found in quotations and statements in Irenaeus and other church fathers such as Clement, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Eusebius, Theodoretus, and Epiphanius. In 1945 some peasants found at Nag Hammadi, in Upper Egypt, a library of Coptic manuscripts, consisting of thirteen codices which are now in process of translation, so our knowledge is being substantially supplemented. The Jung Codex, a small portion of this find, includes four writings: a Letter of James, the Gospel of Truth, a Letter to Rheginos, and the Treatise on the Three Natures.[1]

We know that Valentinus led a movement which flourished in the Mediterranean world during the second century. Its influence was centered in Alexandria and Rome, as well as the regions of the Rhone Valley, where Irenaeus was serving as bishop. Among the influential leaders of the Valentinian school were Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, fragments of whose writings have long been extant. Remarkably, H. C. Puech and G. Quispel in their treatment of the newly discovered Gnostic manuscripts turn again and again to Irenaeus for parallels to portions of these recent Coptic finds.

Irenaeus lived between A. D. 130 and 200. One important locale of his work was Gaul, where he was bishop of Lyons. While bishop in the Rhone Valley, Irenaeus wrote his major work, "Against Heresies," which was also named "Exposure and Refutation of Knowledge So-Called." Here was theology cast in the form of occasional literature, for Irenaeus was addressing himself to a situation near at hand. A moral and religious crisis had developed in the Rhone Valley as a consequence of the work of one Marcus, a magician, who led a school of Valentinian Gnostics.

Preparation for Irenaeus' work was based on first-hand acquaintance with Gnosticism as well as on study of the sources. He had apparently read the commentaries prepared by Ptolemaeus, a leader in Gnosticism as it was current in the western part of the Mediterranean world. He had conversed with disciples of Valentinus, and it was against this group that his polemic was largely leveled.

What Irenaeus was facing in the Rhone Valley was one manifestation of a widespread movement prevalent in the Mediterranean world during as well as before and after the second century. While Gnosticism found its way into the

1 F. L. Cross, ed., *The Jung Codex: A Newly Discovered Gnostic Papyrus* (London: Mowbray, 1955); M. Malinine, H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, eds., *Evangelium Veritatis* (Zuerich: Rascher, 1956); H. C. Puech and G. Quispel. "Les Ecrits Gnostique du Codex Jung," *Vigiliae Christianae,* 8 (1954), 1-51; H. C. Puech and G. Quispel, "Le Quatrieme Ecrit Gnostique du Codex Jung." *Vigiliae Christianae,* 9 (1955), 65-102.

church, actually it was a world religion in its own right and a deadly rival of Christianity rather than simply a heretical offshoot of Christianity. One of the chief exponents who had proved troublesome in second century Christian circles was Valentinus, who had been a leader in Egyptian Christianity.

I

Second century Christians were puzzled when they attempted to explain how the creator was related to his creation. The basic presupposition of many Christians was that God is one and that he is the creator, which implied that he must have performed a dual function. First he would have to serve as the ultimate cause initiating the process of creation, and then as the effective cause carrying out the details of formation required by a complex universe. The main stream of Judaism had readily affirmed that God was both the ultimate and the efficient cause. This raised the problem of how a good God, who was all-powerful, could have created an imperfect world. The question therefore arose whether early Christianity could adopt a mediator and still retain its belief in the creator which it found in Jewish theology.

Curiously, in both Jewish and Christian sources, Gen. 1:26, 27 had stimulated speculation which contravened the position that God alone created the world. A partial explanation of the alternative interpretations is found in the discussion of the problem with whom God was conversing when he said, "Let us make man." In all discussions the ruling presupposition was that the injunction was limited to the particular act of man's creation, not the whole creative process. Nevertheless, the answers given were suggestive of the wider possibilities for each specific form of mediation.

Many Jews and Christians of the early centuries after Christ were not satisfied with the easy explanation, prevalent though it was, that God alone created the world. Gen. 1:26 suggested to them that God had employed subordinate intermediaries in his act of creation.[2] The theory that angels had participated in creation was held by the Gnostics, and it is found in Simon Magus and Menander of Samaria, in Saturninus of Antioch, in the *Apocryphon Johannis,* in Valentinus and sources illustrative of the thinking of his school, among them the fragments of Heracleon, and in the recently discovered "Treatise on the Three Natures."[3] Irenaeus concluded summarily that any such form of mediation was absurd, for God did not need the help of angels in order to create.[4]

2 H. Freedman and M. Simon, translators, *Midrash Rabbah* (London: Soncino Press, 1939), Genesis R. 17:4; Philo, *De Somnis,* 1:22; 14:2; *De Confusione Linguarum,* 34, 174. A peculiar use of terms identified angels with "logoi" in *De Somnis* 1, 22, 142; 23, 147; *De Posteritate Caini,* 26, 191; *Legum Allegoria,* 2, 62, 177.

3 Irenaeus, *Heresies,* 1, 24,1 cf. Justin, *Dialogue,* 35; Eusebius, *Church History,* 4, 22-27; also G. Quispel, in *The Jung Codex,* 66. Citations from Irenaeus are taken from W. W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei Adversus Haereses,* 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1857).

4 Irenaeus, *Heresies,* 1, 24, 3, 4; 1, 30, 5; Hippolytus, *Refutation,* 7, 23, 26; Nock and Festugiere, *Corpus Hermeticum* (Paris: Societe d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1945), 1:9; also Irenaeus, *Heresies,* 2, 2, 4.

In Hellenistic circles many gods were said to have participated in the formation of the universe.[5] Consequently there were those in the second century who explained Gen. 1:26 as a conversation between the supreme deity and other gods. The Gnostics picked up the speculations involving secondary deities to explain the problem of mediation from their point of view.

The Gnostic teaching concerning the gods who participated in creation took many forms. Cerdo, for example, who influenced Marcion, posited two gods. One god, who was good, was the higher, while the other was a lower, cruel god. It was the latter who created the world.[6] Marcion also advanced the theory that two gods control the universe; of these two, the creator was the known god spoken of by St. Paul, also called the "God of this world."[7] Irenaeus scoffed at Marcion's theology by asserting that if the doctrine had any validity, God would be coming to that which did not belong to him and would be trespassing on another's property.

Examples of radical dualism are to be found among the Valentinian systems. Ptolemaeus used the expression *mesotetos* to portray the role played by the creator who was the mediator between the one perfect God and the devil.[8] Heracleon, another Valentinian, developed a theology from the Gospel of John based upon a three-god system. First there was the supreme god, the Father, who was symbolized by God the Spirit and who was to be worshiped in spirit and in truth; the second was the God of the Jews, who was worshiped at Jerusalem; and the third was the God who was worshiped at Samaria, and he was the devil.[9]

The Gnostic doctrine of mediators was not without its critics among second century Christians. Either direct or implied in the arguments of the apologists, among them Justin Martyr and Athenagoras, was an attempted refutation of those who departed from belief in the unity of God. To say that any god was greater than the creator struck Justin as sheer fantasy.[10] A more damaging refutation of the theory that several gods were active in the universe is found in Athenagoras.[11] He held that if there were originally two or more gods, they would have the same being or be independent. If they shared the same godhead, they would be identical, so that there would be no issue. But gods were uncreated, and they could not be the same. Uncreated things were not alike because they were not created to resemble any patterns. Again, Athenagoras, assuming for argument's sake that there were two gods and that one was the creator of the world, asked what would be the place

5 Plato, *Timaeus*, 69C; Aristotle, *De Caelo*, 2, 12, 292 f.; Albinus, *Epitome*, 16; also 10:2. R. E. Witt, *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism* (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), 128; E. A. Leemans, *Numenius van Apamea* (Brussels: Palaix des Academies, 1937), 88, quoting Proclus; G. Quispel, in *The Jung Codex*, 62, 66-68.

6 Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 1, 27, 2; Tertullian, *Against Heresies*, 6.

7 A. Harnack, *Marcion* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1921), 92; Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 3, 7, 1.

8 Epiphanius, *Heresies*, 44:1.

9 W. Voelker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis* (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932), 73, citing Harecleon, Fragment 20.

10 Justin, *Apology*, 26:5; Eusebius, *Church History*, 4, 11, 19; Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 3, 7, 1; 4, 27, 3; Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, 1:6; Harnack, *Marcion*, 98-99.

11 Athenagoras, *Plea*, 8.

or function of a second god. Any god other than the creator would be among the ranks of the celestially unemployed, for he would be fulfilling no purpose. If the creator of the world owned the world, then any other god would be like a dispossessed tenant without a dwelling.

Irenaeus also had his case for belief in one God, although it was not as well developed on logical grounds as the argument of Athenagoras. The supreme God, according to Irenaeus, had no need of anyone. He did not require the assistance of angels in order to create, nor the help of any power inferior to himself. The very nature of God's preeminence in the universe confirmed that he had no need of external instruments in order to produce the world and its creatures.[12] If, as Gnostics and Marcionites suggested, there were to be another principle at work in the world more powerful than the creator, then the more powerful must be the true God.[13]

Against the Gnostics, Irenaeus contended that the more powerful and true God showed his power in functioning as the creator of the world. If one introduced other deities and principles in addition to the creator, a very ridiculous situation would develop. Assuming that more than one god is necessary, one could speculate ad infinitum, always imagining that there are other gods, other pleromas, and other sets of images from which the world was formed.[14] Would the search ever stop?

The obvious conclusion to Irenaeus was that either only one God, one maker, one creator formed all things that were created, or else it would be impossible to stop short of an infinite number of images and an infinite number of gods. Reason, regarded by Irenaeus as an endowment of the soul, led him to a single conclusion: that God is one and that he is the lord of all things.[15]

II

But what did Irenaeus himself believe, aside from his polemic against other views? To answer this question we must study the *five* mediatorial figures which appear in his writings. They are the Sophia-Wisdom, the Pneuma-Spirit, the Logos-Word, and the Son of God, together with the fifth type, the Divine Hands, a synthetic type, and a safeguard to the divine unity.

We shall here consider only the mediation of Sophia-Wisdom. Irenaeus apparently knew an interpretation of Gen. 1:26 which held that in the course of his creative activity God was engaged in conversation with Sophia.[16] This view was suggested by the *hochmah* or *sophia* which appears in Prov. 8:22-30. Here *hochmah* was with God in the beginning, before the creation of the heaven and the earth with all its works. Even though the Hebrew *hochmah* was translated *sophia* rather than *logos* in the Septuagint, the two Greek words were brought together as virtually synonymous in Wisdom 9:1-2.

12 Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 2, 2, 4-5.
13 Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 2, 1, 2.
14 Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 2, 1, 4; 2, 7, 5.
15 Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 2, 6, 1; 2, 27, 2; 3, 25, 1; 4, 6, 6.
16 Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 2, 30, 9.

Many scholars have argued that the writer of Wisd. of Sol. 9:1-2 was not thinking of a personal participant.[17] They point out that although *hochmah* in Prov. 8 was clearly personified and was said to have been before creation, this passage did not say that *hochmah* took an active part in the creative acts. But there was another tradition among the Jews in the second century. R. Yehuda b.-Elai (c. A. D. 150) equated *amun*, which was a difficult reading of Prov. 8:30, with *umen*, meaning "artist" or "master-builder," thereby making the *hochmah* the effective and demiurgic agent in the creative act.[18]

It was a tradition similar to this which was picked up by the Gnostics, so that among the Valentinians Sophia was the effective creator.[19] She was one of the last aeons produced in the duodecad. The Gnostic story of her experience was that, as a result of her intimacy in the embrace of her consort, Theletos, she impulsively desired to comprehend the greatness of the Father. She was restrained from her foolish intention by Horos, who separated her passion from the rest of her body. Sophia then produced a debased copy of herself, called "Achamoth." Here the Valentinians reverted to the Hebrew term *hochmah*.[20] They said that when Achamoth was unable to pass Horos, she was filled with grief, fear, and perplexity. These passions then formed the substance of matter, from which the world was made.

When Irenaeus used the term "Wisdom" in connection with creation, he did not intend to suggest a demiurge or a subordinate creation. What he did mean had long antecedent support. He used "Wisdom" interchangeably with "Word" or "Logos." As W. L. Knox has pointed out, "Wisdom" in Philo was thought to be merely a duplicate of "Word," with the former tending to supplant the latter as a cosmic term.[21] The New Testament shows that the early Christians did virtually the same thing as Philo; for when the Son was mentioned as the "Logos" or "Word" in John 1:3 or in I Cor. 1:24, he was also either the "Sophia" or the "Logos" of God. In his *Dialogue*, 62, Justin also associated the "Son" with "Wisdom."

It is therefore understandable that Irenaeus should interchange "Word" and "Wisdom" and that he should define them further as "Son" and "Spirit." In doing this, he divulged his own conclusion as to the correct interpretation of Gen. 1:26—it was to the "Word" and "Wisdom," the "Son" and "Spirit" that God was speaking when he said, "Let us make man." But even though Irenaeus used "Sophia" in this connection, it is doubtful that he intended an outright hypostatization or demiurge who assisted the creator.

17 G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, 415-416; cf. *DSD* 3:15.

18 Tanhuma B. Ber. Sec. 5:2 f.; see Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1924-1926), II, 356-357. R. Hoshaya the Elder (c. A. D. 225) said the same in *Genesis* R. 1:1.

19 *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 7:1; Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 1, 1, 1.

20 Irenaeus, *Heresies*, 1, 4, 1; cf. also the Second Wisdom of Corpus Hermeticum 1, C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), 131.

21 W. L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Early Christianity* (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), 55.

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

High Church Minority Opposed in Denmark

It has been a long time since I have sent news from the Church of Denmark. The reason for this has not only been laziness on my part. Nor has it been for lack of news about which to write. To be sure, you may have read interesting news items from Denmark during the past months. But my instructions are not to write about news which gets into the press, but rather to suggest the theological significance of basic developments. And in this respect the news from Denmark has been sparse for quite a while. There were no sensations like the tense debate about the ordination of women in Sweden. In fact, Denmark goes on ordaining women and no one pays much attention, including those who thought the world was coming to an end when it first happened.

It is no indictment of a church that there is no excitement for a year or two. In fact, this may be a sign of soundness and quiet growth, just as it might be a sign of stagnation and death. Sometimes it takes time before issues come to a head and lines are drawn in a controversy, or before the significance of a quiet growth becomes evident. At any rate, a relative quiet has characterized the church life of Denmark for many months.

Now, however, a stir has come about. It has been building up for some time, and it embodies within itself some very basic features of Danish church life. Let us first take a look at the background.

In the earlier part of the nineteenth century the Danish church was, roughly speaking, divided into three parts. Two segments had grown out of revival movements, the older Grundtvigian and the more recent and more pietistic Inner Mission group. The third segment comprised the remaining and unclassified portion, although there was a strong minority which revered the ecclesiastical tradition that had survived after Grundtvig, Kierkegaard, Beck, Brandes, and Marx.

When the Ides of Barth, the equinoctical storms of the twenties, hit the land, ranks were split, and a severe reaction to Pietism as well as humanitarianism created a new group, sternly critical and highly intellectual. This fellowship of revolt did not long wave the Barthian banner, and although somewhat nondescript in character, it has become, after a generation of argumentation, more Bultmannistic than anything else. The most notable figure which has risen out of the group is the distinguished historian, Professor P. G. Lindhardt, of Aarhus University, a keen but bitingly sarcastic polemicist.

The revival of theology (and in this connection must be mentioned the revival of Luther studies with Professor Regin Prenter, also of Aarhus University, as the outstanding figure) did not bring about a revival in the church life of the people. A growing indiffer-

ence on the part of the people paralleled the theological furor, and it has become almost proverbial to say that the Danes do not go to church. The reported death of the church, like the report of Mark Twain's death, has been greatly exaggerated, but the lack of smoke does indicate a lack of fire.

It is on this background that recent developments must be seen. As in other countries, Germany and the United States, an ardent minority sought to revive the church by an increased emphasis on liturgical forms and on the office of the ministry. New practices, or sometimes revived older practices, were introduced. Vestments, more highly liturgical services, color and music were called on to make the worship attractive, but most of the innovations were kept within the framework of Lutheran tradition. In fact, nearly all could be found in Lutheran churches in other countries. In some instances extreme practices tended toward Catholicization, such as reservation of elements and Mariolatry.

At first these innovations were received with tolerant amusement, and many of the instances occurred in northern Slesvig, where the nineteenth century tradition was not so strong as in the rest of the country. Eventually, however, amusement turned to irritation and criticism. From a question of liturgy the discussion turned to a question of the authority and function of the pastor. Professor Prenter, who had for some time advocated a greater respect for form and office, defended the practices as permissible within the framework of Lutheranism, although he sharply denounced "Catholic" practices. Somewhat unjustly, Prenter has come to be seen as an *advocatus diaboli*, but he is no extremist. In fact, he stands rather solidly in the middle, to some extent berated by both sides.

The reaction to high church tendencies, which is blowing up quite a storm at present, must not be viewed through American eyes. We must not forget that the Danish church, although not a state church in the sense in which most Americans regard European churches, nevertheless is supported and regulated by the state. Within this framework of administration there is a great deal of freedom for the pastor, and problems are largely settled by interchange of ideas rather than by administrative fiat. A healthy argument is therefore often the best means of arriving at sensible conclusions.

The Danish liturgy seems barren in comparison with Swedish, German, and American practices. And the Danish minister does not pretend to external dignity of office. Both Grundtvig and Kierkegaard took much of the starch out of stuffed shirts. On the other hand, the Danish liturgy has been immeasurably enriched by a tradition of magnificent hymns and emphasis on congregational singing. The Danish liturgy is a hymnal liturgy in which the chants and responses are not missed or even desired because they have been replaced by the varying but living voice of the people. Furthermore, emphasis on the Lord's table, combined with a retained emphasis on the proclaimed Word, has given the minister a spiritual authority which does not need the augmentation of vestment and forms.

When particularly the Grundtvigians, therefore, criticize high church tend-

encies, they do so not out of a stubborn low church simplicity. Their criticism is rather aimed at the double danger that the living voice of the congregation shall be replaced by form and stereotype and that a cultic and sacerdotal sacramentalism shall replace the strongly corporate fellowship of the Lord's table. The challenge of different practices has, however, led to a self-examination which may be very healthy. There is little danger that the church of Denmark will go to high church extremes, and a good discussion about the nature of worship, the sacraments, and the ministry will undoubtedly be good for its soul.

J. Knudsen

Preaching, Psychoanalysis, and Drama in Finland

The question of what to preach and how to do it has been creating considerable critical discussion among laymen and pastors alike. Persons responsible for radio and TV programs in Finland repeatedly voice their anxiety in this matter. They question the wisdom of broadcasting complete services regularly each Sunday from different churches throughout the land. A radio secretary has been appointed, and he is devoting all of his time to the direction of religious broadcasting.

Archbishop Ilmari Salomies has made a public statement on the present practice of preaching. He criticizes the ingrained habit of saying the same pious things in the same way and thus confusing the issue of faithfulness to the Word of God with a monotony of religious speech which is both lifeless and out of touch with modern living.

The head of Finland's newest diocese, Bishop Martti Simojoki of Helsinki, in his widely influential book "The Church and the World," comments on the role of the sermon: "Some people say that there is too much preaching, that there ought to be fewer words and more deeds! It is felt that the 'age of the sermon' is almost over. Certainly we should question the significance of the sermon, even as we consider critically every other area of the church's life. And it might well be that preaching must give way and give precedence to other forms of Christian action. The central question, however, remains: Will the Gospel be more widely and effectively spread by means other than preaching? Ours is a biblical church, and therefore our faithfulness to the Bible compels us to be a preaching church.

"Preach, then, in order that hearers might really listen. Preach to reach an audience over as wide an area as possible. Preach to reveal Jesus Christ to the nation. Preach in a manner which will stimulate hearers to study and to think out the substance of the sermon. Preach in faith, believing that the living Lord himself is at work in the hearts of the hearers. Preach in such a way that the hearer may receive the very help he needs, namely, that he might come to believe.

"Martin Luther referred to the kingdom of God as the kingdom of hearing. In his judgment the church's central task is the proclamation of the Gospel. Proclamation is not primarily teaching (*Belehrung*) but is an act through which God communicates an immeasurable gift (*Beschenkung*).

"The conception of the sermon

which we find in the New Testament and perceive in the works of Luther obligates us, as preachers of the Gospel, to basic self-examination. The sermon is the essential problem of the Lutheran Church. The real question, then, is not how to preach but what to preach. The 'age of the sermon' is not over."

The ministry of mental health is a cause which is receiving concentrated attention in Finland from the newly formed society, "Therapeia," now functioning under the leadership of Dr. Martti Siirala, a physician and psychoanalyst, with headquarters in Jarvenpaa, at the Parish Institute. The objective of "Therapeia" is to combine the insights of depth-psychology and evangelical theology through competent practical and theoretical studies. The psychology of religion, in its usual sense, is thought to be inadequate to meet the modern challenge of saving, healing, and building up human personalities.

The legitimate theater is widely recognized as a cultural-spiritual force of deep significance in the life of the Finns. The many theaters throughout the country are well attended and are often referred to as "forums of truth" which expose the realities of the human situation. The Church of Finland has established a Commission on the Church and the Theater, headed by Professor Arvi Kivimaa, Christian layman, author, and director of the Finnish National Theater. The study of the relation of theater arts and the Christian faith is under consideration, as well as the production of dramas to project the meaning of Christian life.

Jacob W. Heikkinen

Correspondence and Comment

Paradosis and Apokalupsis in I Corinthians 11:23

Prepositions are notoriously important in the theater of communication. They are notorious because they often become involved in the kind of ambiguity to which Professor George O. Evenson called attention in his article, "The Force of *apo* in I Corinthians 11:23."[1] Here we find it unclear whether Paul intends *apo tou kuriou* to mean that he received a revelation directly from the Lord or indirectly through the tradition. This preposition is important because no less than the principle of authority is involved: does Paul's authority depend upon a special content of revelation given to him in a vision, or does it rest adequately upon an unbroken tradition in which he stands as a link in a chain which was originally begun by the historical Jesus?

Professor Evenson said that "the preposition *apo* in I Cor. 11:23 in no sense proves that Paul was dependent on the *paradosis* for his Gospel." He cites as reasons (1) Gal. 2:6 in which Paul denies that he depends on a *paradosis,* (2) I Cor. 11:2 in which Paul supposedly contrasts *paradosis* with what he says he receives *apo tou kuriou,* and (3) many other instances in which *apo* and *para* can be used interchangeably so that it is not proper to say that Paul was referring to a tradition rather than a revelation because he used *apo* rather than *para.*

We may grant that it is lexically untenable to say that *apo* by itself indicates that Paul is dependent upon a tradition for the content of his Gospel.[2] But then it must also be granted that *apo* by itself does not prove that Paul was dependent upon a special revelation either. If the prepositions are interchangeable a mere linguistic analysis will not be sufficient to determine whether Paul meant that he received the Gospel directly from the side of (*para*) the Lord, or indirectly from the Lord through the tradition (*apo*). Much more than a mere preposition is involved here, and we must be careful not to neglect historical and semantic principles in our exegesis of this text. The preposition *apo* is in a sentence together with a verb which in turn has its subject and object. The matter is complicated still further when we realize that this verb has been compounded with the prefix *para.* Actually Paul does not say simply *apo tou kuriou,* but he also says he received his teaching *para tou kuriou.* In the last analysis no clear light can be found by examining the prepositions, and Evenson is right to challenge the dogmatism which tries to define a

1 *The Lutheran Quarterly,* XI (1959), p. 244.

2 W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1957), p. 87. Although Bauer thinks Paul is "taught by the Lord himself," he lists such imposing figures as Zahn, Feine, J. Weiss, Bachmann, Lietzmann, Holtzmann, Sickenberger, and Schlatter as defending an indirect communication.

preposition in terms of a theological theory.

But there seems to be another theory lurking in the shadows of Evenson's challenge which is equally false. Evenson did not explicitly say that if Paul did not receive the content of his Gospel from a historical tradition he must have received it from a special vision, but if this was implied in his remarks about the force of *apo,* then it would seem necessary to question such an implication. We have here a false dilemma. It is too easily assumed that either Paul received his Gospel from his association with human witnesses who in turn heard it from Jesus, or he received a special revelation through a vision, probably the one on the way to Damascus. Some might argue that this vision gave him no new content about the Gospel but did give him a new interpretation which was not known to him or others before that time; but this is really beside the point, which is whether human experience or divine revelation is the authority behind Paul's Gospel.

It would be a gross misunderstanding of the meaning of *paradosis* in the New Testament to limit it to a merely historical deposit handed down within a continuing community. There are three uses of *paradosis* which must be distinguished in the New Testament. (1) The rabbis referred to their continuing life under the Law as the *paradosis ton presbuteron.*[3] Paul refers to this Jewish tradition in Gal. 1:14. (2) The pagan world also had its tradition, and this was specifically called by Paul in Col. 2:8 the *paradosis ton anthropon.*[4] Clearly there is no simple alternative between the authority of a historical tradition and the direct authority of the Lord. The choice is rather between the tradition of the elders in Judaism, the tradition of men in paganism, and (3) *the living tradition of the Lord in the church.* Thus Paul refers to this tradition in I Cor. 11:2 and again in II Thess. 2:15 and 3:6.

The *paradosis* to which Paul refers in this positive Christian sense is the living tradition under the lordship of the risen Christ which has replaced the legitimate *paradosis ton presbuteron* as well as the corrupt traditions of men. The Christian confession was that Jesus Christ is Lord, and as such he replaces all Jewish *paradosis* because he is the fulfillment of the Law. His risen presence in the community of saints, "while the Lord worked with them," provided a living tradition which was handed from one to another (Mark 16:19). This means that the Lord was not simply the historical person remembered by the community but the living presence of the risen Christ who by his Spirit guided the community into all truth (John 16:13). The Gospel was forged in the heat of this revelatory experience. No special visions or divine interventions can explain the edifying life of this community which now lived in Christ and walked in the Spirit. Indeed, Soren Kierkegaard has said somewhere that Spirit is the denial of direct immediacy. If Christ be very God he must be un-

3 Jesus also speaks of this Jewish *paradosis* in Mark 7:3, 5; Matt. 15:2.

4 It is very possible that Paul was referring not to Gentile religious traditions but to Jewish gnosticism here, but this would have been a paganizing of the Jewish tradition.

known, for to be known directly is the characteristic mark of an idol!

We must do more than examine prepositions; we must ask the force of *ego,* and *parelabon,* and *kuriou,* and *paredoka,* and *humin.* When Paul refers to himself by means of the emphatic *ego* he is declaring his authority as an apostle to the factious members of the Corinthian church. Paul's emphasis here is exactly the same as his appeal to the Galatians (cf. Gal. 1:11). When Paul says his authority does not rest upon what he received from the "pillars," he does not mean that he is independent of the Christian *paradosis.* Paul does not mention the *paradosis* of the Christian church in Galatians in any pejorative sense. He is rather saying that his witness is just as authoritative for this *paradosis* as the witness of the "pillars" because he stands within this tradition under the same Lord.

Parelabon and *paredoka* clearly indicate the transmission of a tradition: what is received is given over to others. The *humin* as members of the church complete the chain from the Lord through Paul to the believers in Corinth. This is the nature of the church that it is a fellowship of communication. The source of the communciation is the Lord, but certainly the Lord must not be understood merely as the first in the historical series, which progresses through Paul and on to the Corinthians. We might get such a false notion from the metaphor of a chain in the *paradosis,* but the Christian *paradosis* is not a chain but a living organism in which there is constant communication such that each edifies the other through love. The special force of *ego* in Paul's witness involves the special position of the apostle in this living tradition. Here it becomes necessary to distinguish the authority of apostolic tradition from the ensuing ecclesiastical tradition, a distinction similar to that between canonical and non-canonical Christian literature.[5]

Also it is necessary for us to know that the customary distinction between *paradosis* and *apokalupsis* falls apart upon careful New Testament examination. We find now that it is precisely in the living tradition as experienced through the leadership of the apostles under the guidance of the Spirit that authoritative revelation was received. This is why Paul could speak so boldly against the "pillars." They had through their office no special advantage over Paul. It was, on the other hand, not his vision near Damascus that constituted the authoritative revelation of Jesus Christ to Paul, but his life in the living tradition of the church. This does not minimize the importance of his Damascus experience in the least, but it does recognize that this expepience gave Paul no particular advantage or hitherto secret knowledge about Christ which the community did not have. It simply brought a change of direction in the life of Paul (who in turn made his special impact on the church).

Furthermore this coupling of revelation with life in the tradition does not discount the special sense of revelation which distinguished apostles from the rest of the tradition. The special election of apostles to be witnesses is not

5 Oscar Cullmann, *The Early Church* (Philadelphia, 1951), p. 75.

an occurrence in a vacuum but a historical event which for its authentication had also to be acknowledged by the non-apostolic members of the tradition. A parallel to this thought may be found in the authority of Scripture which is guaranteed not merely by the writers but also by the reader, for Scripture must be written under the Spirit but also read in the Spirit if it is to have authority. So likewise apostles receive and pass on revelation in the living tradition with authority only when their witness is received and again passed on with the same guarantee of the Spirit.

When Paul received his Gospel *apo tou kuriou* he received a revelation within the living tradition which was acknowledged as the common witness of the church by the tradition itself. The Lord was recognized to be *the Lord of the tradition,* not an absentee deity who occasionally used the *tour de force* of a vision (*deus ex machina!*), but a real presence who lives and works among his own in his church.

Robert Paul Roth

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

The Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions. By A. C. Bouquet. New York: Harpers, 1958. 430 pages. $7.00.

The problem that Dr. Bouquet deals with in this book is worthy of the attention of all theologians, and the author has given us an excellent and comprehensive examination of it. The problem is that of the attitude of Christianity to the non-Christian religions *in our own time.* Today Christianity faces a new kind of situation with respect to other religions. Fifty years ago they were on the defensive. Today many of these religions are no longer sitting quietly in the background but are aggressively asserting their claims. Bouquet mentions Buddhism and Islam especially, which have mission movements too. Then there is also Communism, for even though it is a repudiation of religion, it "proposes itself as an alternative force of human integration." There is furthermore Hinduism, which is put forward today as the universal religion, magnanimously also including Christianity in its fold. While it can be shown that Christianity in the last 150 years has expanded more than it ever had before, so that it truly is world-wide in fact as well as idea, nevertheless the cold facts are, as Dr. Bouquet points out, that today "there are actually more non-Christians in the world than there were on the day of Pentecost. . . ."

The author asks us to examine more carefully why the non-Christian religions have provided so many people a rich and satisfying inner life, and suggests as his own answer that there is a *relatedness* among all religions. But a satisfying *inner* life is also not the major criterion of the truth of any religion. In this connection Dr. Bouquet points out that the present-day polemics of other religions against Christianity is interesting in its illogicality—namely, that they judge Christianity by Christian standards, and they are re-writing their credentials to make them more like Christianity.

Dr. Bouquet's book, as he insists, is a work of *Christian theology* (it appears as one of the series entitled "The Library of Constructive Theology"). It is not a history of religions in the conventional sense, although he includes much historical material. He says he speaks as an Anglican also, and cites Charles Gore's comment that Anglicans "are so free from the obscurantist fear of historical enquiry" that they can serve all Christendom with their objectivity. No doubt readers of Lutheran and other persuasions will take that claim with a grain of salt.

The book then goes on to discuss the great religions historically to the time of Christ, the rise and expansion of Christianity, the doctrine of the logos, Islam, and "The Change to the Modern World," which includes the challenge of Marxism, the liberation of the Afro-Asian world and the prominence of America in Christendom, and finally contemporary theological revaluation, wherein he includes a long (90-page) and detailed survey of the views of twenty-two theologians and movements as to their attitude to non-Christian religions. In this latter section, as well as through the entire book, the name of Hendrik Kraemer looms prominently, for it is Kraemer's famous work, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (1938), which provides Dr. Bouquet the opportunity for an *Auseinandersetzung,* chiefly due to Bouquet's orientation in a "logos-theology" as over against Kraemer's more Barthian orientation. Thus the book is very thorough, the knowledge of the author is considerable, and his interests are far-ranging. He argues cogently that in our modern world a Christian apologetic cannot omit discussing relations to contemporary science, technology, and philosophy.

Lutheran theologians—pastors and laymen alike—will find this book well worth careful study and especially worthy of care-

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

ful comparison with Kraemer's earlier volume. It lacks an index, however, which is unfortunate in a work so detailed and encyclopedic as this one.

WILLIAM H. K. NARUM

Four Existentialist Theologians: A Reader from the Works of Maritain, Berdyaev, Buber, and Tillich. Selected with introduction and notes. By Will Herberg. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958.

This is a well-chosen set of readings from a quartette of soloists! Each has a voice of his own, and despite the help of Will Herberg, who conducts and governs the best he can, the harmony, supposedly existentialism, is not very clear. But, the editor combines a judicious eye with his outrageous symphony, and despite the title and the imposed typification, some of the best things of the respective authors are nonetheless included. Besides, one gets Herberg's notes and introduction, a lot of information, and a choice between hardcover (Doubleday Anchor) and paperbound (Anchor Books). So one can scarcely go wrong. This is a fine piece for those uninitiated in current theologizing because it includes so many elemental and crucial pieces; it is a useful piece for more sophisticated readers because it focuses such a miscellany of writing upon relatively few topics.

Herberg's introduction (pp. 1-25) is a masterful piece of expository writing. And it is no fault of the editor that all the weaknesses, the intellectual blunders, and the grandiose confusions of contemporary theology are made so evident. For surely Tillich, Maritain, Berdyaev, and, to a lesser extent perhaps, Buber too, mirror in the language of philosophers and theologians the difficulties felt by many cultivated persons in our time. So, it seems to me, many bright and talky people in our day confess to problems respecting "values," "our culture," "the meaning of history," "being," "the truth of religion," etc. One does not need to keep one's ear even close to the ground to hear the welter of voices on behalf of such issues. Nor is it uncommon for a professor of philosophy to be told that philosophy ought to discuss the higher things of life, the "big" problems that seem generic to the race.

Contemporary theology is praised by Will Herberg for its relevance. He admits that the theologians he excerpts are neither representing nor pointing to their traditions—in some sense of the term they are not orthodox; but neither are they heterodox or wanton, for they are concerned with "frontiers," as the expression goes, with "meaning and direction in the crisis of the culture of our time." So, it would seem, they are relevant to the rest of men who raise questions by entertaining those same questions and proposing the same answers. I, for one, have no doubts that this is a correct delineation of what many theologians, especially the popular ones, are doing. They have companions in Arnold Toynbee, Pitirin Sorokin, some literary critics, and the host of intelligentsia who claim to be anxious, guilty, and puzzled.

Surely it is a merit to be relevant. One can expect a rational man to answer the same question that was asked and not another one. But it is also the case that bright people can make blunders and perpetrate nonsense. To a surprising extent mistakes of the most egregious and vitiating sort to the intelligentsia survive not as answers but as questions or problems. "Answers," or whatever one wishes to call these extended essays of philosophical men, do not seem to be taken as seriously as the questions which they purport to answer. Intelligent people learn these questions often by inference from the grand and stylish literature of the sages, from Plato, Lucretius, Aristotle, and the rest. Contemporary theology, which we all know seems so ecumenical, so existential, so timely, so everything, is modish and relevant because it takes these learned questions so seriously. College audiences, and psychiatrists, "medical men, educators, historians, artists, writers, . . ." (p. 24) are all ripe for the theologians' picking.

There must be a place for evangelical theology which would address the Gospel and the Law of God to intelligent men. But I am not sure that these existentialist theologians, including Mr. Herberg, are evangelical because of their theology. That some kind of good news keeps sneaking through their talk is not to credit their intellectual orientation as much as it is to credit their pathos and faith. Much of their theology,

and especially those strands of it which are so relevant, suffers from the lack of scrutiny of the questions men so often ask. It perhaps would be to the merit of theologians, however they handle God's unmerited grace, to examine these pretense-ful questions and show us how confused such questions really are. My suspicion is that when all the acclaim is over and the account is finally drawn up, that the theologian's grace, if he seeks to evangelize, is not to answer the question of the intelligentsia but to lead us to the Scripture and to God, which and who, in turn, causes us to ask another question.

PAUL HOLMER

The Fear of God. By Fred A. Berthold. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 158 pages. $3.00.

This is a small but intriguing volume. The author is dean of the William Jewett Tucker Foundation and professor of religion at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire. He is particularly conversant with the literature and thought of modern psychology and certainly is no novice in the realm of theology. What makes this work exciting is the author's frank attempt to develop a natural theology on the foundation of the common human experience of anxiety.

After introducing the reader to the present theological situation, which he interprets in the light of the extensive mutual influence of psychology and theology, Berthold moves to a somewhat detailed analysis of the experience of three quite different but prominent figures. The first is the Catholic mystic, Teresa of Avila. In her writings he singles out three modes of anxiety: anxiety over finitude and death, over sin, and anxiety to be united with God. These are not completely separate modes, and really the desire for God dominates her fear because of sin and also her fear of death. The author finds in her anxiety what he considers a natural desire "to love what one ought to love, do what one ought to do, become what one ought to be. Anxiety is . . . the inner side of the forward thrust of life. . . . Anxiety is dreadful; but it is also literally a sign of life" (p. 39).

The second object of this analysis is Martin Luther, particularly his idea of "The Strange Work of God." Here he draws out such observations as the following: "Anxiety is the means by which God shatters our false security and teaches us what true faith is" (p. 42). "Anxiety is the means by which God cures us of our self-sufficiency and brings us to trust in his grace. It is the loving embrace of God" (p. 44). "Because of anxiety one seeks to flee from God, but the whole world is too narrow; one cannot escape from God" (p. 46).

The third, and somewhat surprising object of this analysis is Sigmund Freud. From Freud the author takes the definition of "anxiety" as the result of "an increase of excitation without a corresponding means of discharging it" (p. 50). Wherever such anxiety occurs it is to be treated as a danger signal, reflecting the helplessness of an individual who feels threatened. It is basically a fear one feels lest something occur to cut one off from the object of one's desire (p. 57).

The author's conclusion is that "there is a desire for God which is not only not expunged by sin but which is even exemplified in the consciousness of sin (i.e., anxiety)" (p. 84). There is no claim that this desire for God is meritorious, but it leads him to reject what Lutherans have understood by the doctrine of "total depravity." He seems to believe that Luther and Calvin held to this doctrine simply as a safeguard for God's initiative in salvation. Could it not be that they held to this doctrine because, with respect to salvation, they also believed it was true to reality?

Berthold seems to argue that since man lives in a state of anxiety, this can be equated with an unfulfilled desire, which is in turn a desire for God. Since there is such a desire, there must of necessity be an object to fulfill such desire, i.e., God. In this respect the book belongs to the large group of contemporary writings that are reacting against the emphasis upon the revelation of God, through his Word, as the exclusive means by which one is brought into a living relationship with the living and saving God. To this reviewer, Berthold's case is something less than convincing. His volume is nonetheless very profitable reading.

ARNOLD E. CARLSON

The Story of Christian Hymnody. By E. E. Ryden. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1959. 670 pages. $5.95.

Those who have read and enjoyed Ryden's *The Story of Our Hymns* (Augustana Book Concern, 1930) will be pleased to see this volume, for it is a revision and an expansion of the earlier one. The format is the same, but the type face and the general appearance of the second is superior to that of the first. The author retains the same popular, journalistic style of writing. It is easy to read. The chapters are short. The historical facts concerning hymns and writers emerge from the narrative flow of the text. The author keys his presentation to the layman in order to try to stimulate a more active interest in the hymns of the church. Much of the material is repeated verbatim from the first volume, the author making changes only where he has uncovered some new fact since that writing.

In this volume Dr. Ryden has doubled the amount of material devoted to early chant and hymnody. The section on German hymnody remains about the same as that in the previous volume, but that on English hymnody is greatly expanded. In the interim since he wrote his first book the author has had recourse to a good deal of material which has been written on this subject by such eminent hymnologists as Percy Dearmer, Ruth Ellis Messenger, and Canon Winfred Douglas, among others. One wonders if this emphasis on English hymnody reflects a general increase in the use of English hymns on the part of American Lutherans. Significant additions to this volume include discussions of later hymnals, such as the English *Song of Praise,* the Episcopalian *Hymnal 1940,* the Missouri Synod's *The Lutheran Hymnal,* and the recent *Service Book and Hymnal* put out by the cooperating synods within the National Lutheran Council. Dr. Ryden, for twenty-five years the editor of *The Lutheran Companion,* the official organ of the Augustana Lutheran Church, was one of the members of the joint commission which edited the new hymnal. His position on the commission afforded him a unique opportunity to bring to light much information of interest with the result that this chapter in the book is of unusual, immediate interest. Some indexes and a very brief bibliography bring the book to a close. A more exhaustive bibliography would have added greatly to the value of the book.

The casual reader will enjoy Dr. Ryden's treatment of the hymns in this book. He will discover many facts about hymns which he has been singing since his childhood, and he will not be burdened with technical details. The serious reader will probably be disappointed and slightly suspicious when he sees catchy chapter titles, such as, "The Hymn that Grew out of a Quarrel," "The Bird of a Single Song," and he might well grow weary of the generous use of descriptive adjectives. He will undoubtedly forgive, with a chuckle, the printer's error on page 612 that has Henry Eyster Jacobs serving as professor of Systematic Theology at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia 1883 to 1993. But, if he is a musician, he might also question that author's careless use of the superlative when he terms Ralph Vaughan Williams the "greatest contemporary composer." The difficulty with the popular approach to the handling of this type of subject is that it does not always draw distinct lines between what is generally accepted as fact and what is merely opinion. The result is that the casual reader is misled. The serious one becomes disillusioned.

The technique of establishing the worth of a given lyric and its musical setting by means of a popularity poll ought to be left to the world of entertainment. It was disappointing to note that the author included, with practically no changes from his earlier book, the comparisons of thirty-year-old polls in his discussions of the hymns "Rock of Ages" and "Abide with Me."

No doubt many readers of this book will be left with a deeper appreciation of the hymns they sing. It is time, however, that someone undertook the task of treating the hymns of the church somewhat more objectively. Not in the manner of companions to various hymnals, where the cold facts are simply recited. These have their well-deserved place. But this reviewer would like to see a serious evaluation of our hymns in the light of the theology of the church, a sound appraisal of their worth musically and textually, as well as their suitability for

corporate use in the church of today. Such a task would indeed be a monumental one. But it could provide the church with a sound basis for the use of its hymns.

GERHARD M. CARTFORD

Sing to the Lord. By a Committee. Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, 1959. 400 pages. $2.50, $2.25 for 5 or more copies.

"This hymnal invites families, as well as church groups, to declare and to celebrate the good news of the Christian gospel. It offers almost 300 hymns and responses, and a wide variety of other resources for worship in home and church." These opening sentences from the preface quite adequately sum up the purpose and contents of this simple, attractively bound book.

The collection of hymns constitutes about two-thirds of the book and includes the standard hymns sung in this country. Added to these are many fresh tunes and texts worthy of being sung, though more appropriately, perhaps, in private than in corporate worship. The editing of text and music is, generally, of a high grade. The text is kept within the lines of the musical score, is thus easy to read. Some of the songs composed especially for children border on the trite. The children fare best when they are given tunes of a folk-like character which have already stood the test of time. One wonders to what extent hymnal editors should try to provide special music for children at all. Perhaps a limited amount is all right. It has been the observation of this reviewer, however, that children will sing almost anything given to them, and will sing it well. The question arises then: Why not teach the children to sing the great hymns of the church so that they will know them as they grow older? Anyone who works in church knows how little time there is to teach people the hymns of the church, and the older people get the harder the job becomes. The hymns learned in one's youth are the favorites of the older years. They ought, therefore, to be hymns of real worth.

The portion of the book which deals with suggestions for worship is quite extensive, occupying about one-third of the book. It is divided into six sections, the two greater sections containing suggestions for family and church worship. These are followed by a collection of scattered readings from Scripture, put together for different occasions. Then come a collection of litanies and prayers and a selection of devotional poetry and prose representing writers all the way from St. Paul to Albert Schweitzer. The concluding section is called "Out of our Heritage," and includes the Te Deum, the Decalogue, the Beatitudes, the Twenty-third Psalm, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed.

The user's appreciation for the last third of the book will depend largely upon his liturgical orientation. This section presupposes no thoroughgoing acquaintance with the traditional liturgy of the church. Its approach is that of the planned, religious program. The portion dealing with the home—where there is greater freedom for this sort of devotional programming than there is in church—has many points of merit, especially for the person who is already in weekly contact with the liturgical lifestream of the church. The portion dealing with church worship leaves much to be desired. Services with specific emphases are contrived by putting together texts, prayers, quotations, and musical effects with a view toward impressing the individual involved. The primary thrust is psychological, the general orientation anthropocentric. There is almost totally lacking a real sense of the church as the communion of saints, the Body of Christ. Ideally, worship in the family ought to be conceived of as a private extension of what takes place in the larger family gathered in church. And conversely, the worship of the church should be construed as an amplification of the private devotions to the family.

This book is recommended as an added source of inspiration for those to whom their own church hymnal is already a staff of their daily Christian lives. It is not recommended for use by church groups. They ought to use their regular hymnal. The danger with such a hymnal as this is that it will tend to supplant, rather than supplement, the regular hymnal of a congregation.

Perhaps this would be a good place to underline a need which this hymnal points up: a small, well conceived companion book

to the two current, standard Lutheran hymnals which could be used in the home and would contain suggestions for making use of the devotional resources in the hymnals.

GERHARD M. CARTFORD

An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. By Alan Richardson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 423 pages. $5.00.

This book is indicative of the radical change that has taken place in the critical study of the New Testament in recent years. The rise of historical criticism seemed to make impossible a consistent theology of the New Testament. There was believed to be no unity in all the diversity, and the best any conscientious New Testament scholar could do was to describe the confusion of theologies thrown together in a haphazard collection of documents. If some kind of unity in diversity was found, the accusation was ready at hand that this was only reading into the record the preconceived notions of the scholar.

Today, as Mr. Richardson points out, it is recognized that every historian brings to his study a principle of interpretation. Hence if he approaches his study from the point of view of the comparative study of religions, of which Christianity is merely one, he will find evidence to support his thesis. On the other hand, the one who believes Christianity to be unique and who regards the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Old Testament will view the evidence with altogether different eyes. It is, therefore, above all essential that the historian be aware of his presuppositions so that he may then proceed in as objective a way as possible.

On this basis Mr. Richardson believes the task of the New Testament theologian to be the testing of hypotheses set up to account for the literature. His own position is clearly stated, "In this book . . . the hypothesis is defended that Jesus himself is the author of the brilliant reinterpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation (Old Testament theology) which is found in the New Testament, and that the events of the life, 'signs,' passion, and resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the apostolic witness, can account for the 'data' of the New Testament better than any other hypothesis current today" (p. 12). Thus the book is written from within the so-called theological circle, listening to the testimony of revelation itself and not judging it from the outside. Presumably this does not require of the theologian that he himself be a believer, but only that he honestly test the hypothesis. The book is nevertheless intended not merely as an academic exercise but as an aid in the task of preaching today.

Comprehensive treatment is then given to all the major New Testament themes. Especially good are the initial chapters in which the uniqueness of faith in the historical Jesus ("faith and hearing") and the relation between "knowledge and revelation" are set forth. The other subjects treated are "the power of God unto salvation," "the kingdom of God," "the Holy Spirit," "the reinterpreted Messiahship," "the Christology of the apostolic church," "the life of Christ," "the resurrection, ascension, and victory of Christ," "the atonement wrought by Christ," "the whole Christ," "the apostolic and priestly ministry," "ministries within the church," "the theology of Baptism," "the eucharistic theology of the New Testament."

Mr. Richardson is a careful scholar, and it appears to this reviewer that for the most part his hypothesis is convincingly defended. The old hermeneutical principle that the Scriptures must be interpreted by Scriptures is vindicated. Without resort to any claims of verbal inspiration or "inscripturated revelation" the evidence seems overwhelmingly to support the historic Christian faith as over against radical reinterpretations. Nevertheless, it seems that in some instances Mr. Richardson is too eager to defend his hypothesis and that he finds what he chooses to find. It is granted that Bultmann also allows his orientation to color what he finds, yet he is too competent a scholar to be dismissed as cavalierly as Mr. Richardson does. Without accepting Bultmann's whole program of demythologization, it is quite possible to hold that the Gnostic imprint on the New Testament is greater than Mr. Richardson allows. In any case, Bultmann has made quite clear the radical difference between the New Testament kerygma and the Gnosticism which serves as its foil. It is just misinformation to designate Bultmann himself as a Gnostic. Bultmann is not just

the victim of modern existentialism, but he discerns clearly the perennial human situation to which the kerygma addresses itself as the good news which liberates man and makes him the new being in Christ. Once the theology of the New Testament is clearly discerned, as, I believe, for the most part Mr. Richardson discerns it, then the task remains to formulate a theology which does justice to the Gospel while addressing the situation today. Then much of the theological formulation which served to address a past generation will be recognized as unnecessary freightage today because of the variables involved.

It is particularly with respect to the episcopacy and the eucharist that Mr. Richardson is guilty of special pleading. Why introduce the witness of the post-apostolic church, where the New Testament is silent, only in these instances? Why not let the New Testament witness stand by itself if this is a theology of the New Testament? If the paradosis is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, then it is very peculiar that this guidance is conveniently restricted to the writer's own predilections. Why not then follow the whole Roman Catholic development through the years? It seems that the New Testament itself must provide the norm by which subsequent developments, even in the early church, are to be judged. This is not to advocate a narrow biblicism which denies the presence of the Holy Spirit in the church through the years, but it is pleading for some norm other than either the Bible or tradition or a combination of the two. That norm is the Gospel itself, which is what it is and which needs constantly to be rediscovered.

Despite such criticism this book deserves high praise. It will do much to further the understanding of the Gospel. Especially helpful is the repeated warning to remember that the full meaning of the Gospel is not exhausted in one formulation. There are many facets to the same truth which find a variety of expressions in the New Testament itself.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

An Outline of Old Testament Theology. By Th. C. Vriezen. Boston: Charles T. Branford Co., 1959. 388 pages. $7.50.

The distinctive value of this translation of the second Dutch edition of Vriezen's work lies in the 126-page introductory section. While the remainder of the volume presents a good survey of the content of Old Testament theology, the introduction makes an original contribution in the author's serious attempt to wrestle with basic matters often ignored in theologies of the Old Testament. The same sensitivity to the all-important significance of history in the Old Testament which has led Procksch and von Rad to prefix historical surveys to their theologies leads Vriezen instead to a discussion of the underlying issue of "the historical character of the Old Testament revelation." This he follows with a brief survey of the theological perspective of the various writings. Then in a highly stimulating section he tackles the consequent questions of the authority of the Old Testament as the Word of God and of its use in the church. While admitting that the question of the Old Testament's authority "is essentially of a dogmatic nature and will have to be dealt with at length in dogmatics," the professor from the University of Utrecht insists that "it should not be neglected in a theology of the Old Testament that is aware of its responsibility." "It is especially necessary," he claims, "to set the doctrine of the Old Testament as the Word of God in the light of the facts and to confront it with the data found by research in historical and literary criticism" (p. 79).

Vriezen's concept of the nature of Old Testament theology is strikingly and, to this reviewer, pleasantly different from that commonly envisaged in America. In Vriezen's eyes the "division of labour between dogmatic and biblical theology" advanced by Gabler "is no longer desirable" (p. 119). Eissfeldt instead has rightly pointed Old Testament theology to its starting point in the Christian faith rather than in the history of religion. "As a theological branch of scholarship the theology of the Old Testament . . . must work, therefore, with *theological standards* and must give *its own evaluation of the Old Testament message on the ground of its Christian theological starting-point*" (p. 122). Because of this conviction matters of *religionsgeschichte* are deliberately omitted in the content survey which follows the introduction. In place of *religionsgeschichte*

Vriezen feels an Old Testament theology must present the message of the Old Testament in "confrontation with the New Testament." Surprisingly enough this confrontation is confined to a minimum in the remainder of the volume. Perhaps this fact is accounted for by the somewhat strange statement on p. 124 that "the confrontation with the New Testament need not always take up a prominent position or be elaborated, but in principle it is always present, even if only in the way of arranging the materials."

The analysis of the actual content of Old Testament theology consists in chapters on "The knowledge of God as an intimate relationship," "God," "Man," "The intercourse between God and Man," "The intercourse between man and man (ethics)," and "God, Man and the World in the present and the future." Particularly well done is the section on the cult. The treatment given wisdom literature is somewhat thin, and the whole area of the continuous hidden activity of God in the control of history (especially in the Joseph story and the Court History of David) is passed over almost completely. Especially commendable is the extensive use made of material from the Psalter.

Like most translations the book does not read too easily, but, apart from a few minor items such as "homeletic" on p. v and a wavering throughout between "judgment" and "judgement," the work of translating and editing seems to have been well done.

RONALD M. HALS

The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. 308 pages. $4.00.

The area of scholarship relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls continues to be exciting even after more than a decade has passed since the discovery of the Scrolls. Krister Stendahl, the editor of this volume, is well aware both of the fascinations and the problems of the study of the Scrolls, having written his doctoral dissertation, published under the title of *The School of St. Matthew*, on the problem of interpretation, especially as it concerns the Commentary on Habakkuk. In the Introduction, Professor Stendahl indicates that the relationship of the Scrolls and the New Testament is the catalyst which has accounted for the wide interest in the discoveries at Qumran, and he has therefore assembled these articles, all except three of which have been published in journals or periodicals of a scholarly nature.

Those who are acquainted with some of the literature on the Scrolls will recognize immediately such names as Oscar Cullmann, whose article, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," appeared in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, and William Brownlee, whose article on John the Baptist is reprinted from *Interpretation*. Perhaps that which is most appreciated is the translation of certain articles heretofore not available in English. Belonging to this category are three contributions by Karl Georg Kuhn, who has for some years been interested in the study of the Scrolls. In the first of these three articles Kuhn says that the Qumran Community's messianic expectation, the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," was a double one, priestly and political. The two Messiahs, according to the Manual of Discipline, would stand in the Eschaton with a third figure, the new prophetic lawgiver. The three ideas associated with the figures, while independent in the Scroll material, converge upon Jesus in the later church concept of prophet, priest, and king. If one accepts the three figures suggested by Kuhn, the interpretation certainly provides an interesting background for the later thought. One may ask, however, if the three figures are so clearly delineated in the Scroll material.

Perhaps special mention should also be made of the article by W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit." In this illuminating article the author holds that while Paul uses the terminology of the Sect, his use is not necessarily informed in the same way as that of the Sect, nor does it share the same doctrinal formation.

The article by Bo Reicke, "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents," suggests that if the structure of the primitive church be regarded as complex, there is another group contemporary with, or older than, the primitive church which, while an organic unity, had

several different constitutional tendencies existing side by side.

It is very likely that it is in the area of relationships to the New Testament that the Scrolls will have their most significant impact, and the thoughtful reader will be grateful for the illumination which this collection of articles provides. The inclusion, albeit at the end of the book, of extensive footnotes for each article will provide good bibliography for those who incline to a further reading and study of the Scrolls.

PHILIP A. QUANBECK

What Luther Says. An Anthology. Compiled by Ewald M. Plass. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. 3 volumes, boxed. xxvi, 1,667 pages. $25.00.

This huge warehouse of canned Luther may be either a help or a horror. Into the compilation have gone prodigious labor, ingenuity, and loving care, and therefore out of it may come much good. There is a fabulous amount of Luther quotation here, in excellent translation and well cross-indexed for convenient reference. Under nearly 200 headings are gathered 5,100 items. Occasionally the quotations are very brief, but all in all they average a generous third of a page in length; a happy inspiration was the inclusion of the whole Small Catechism, two dozen of Luther's hymns, and almost the entire summary of Luther's faith from his "Confession concerning Christ's Supper." Each item is given a label and brief introduction, informative or edifying, and each is identified by date and located in the Weimar, Erlangen, and St. Louis editions and, where possible, the Philadelphia and the new American editions. The pearls in each necklace are thoughtfully strung together; the treatment of the Lord's Supper, for example, seemed to me especially well done, though I would have expected more from "Babylonian Captivity" and the Large Catechism there. This is one of twenty headings that occupy twenty pages or more, and the topic "Christ" runs to over sixty. The usefulness of the work is enhanced by four appendixes: biographical sketches, a list of Luther-editions and of Luther's principal writings, a chronology from 1453 to 1555, and an annotated bibliography on Luther in English and German—and by two indexes: subject and scriptural. Clearly, this anthology can be a great help to casual and curious readers in search of an item or two, or just browsing, to neophyte students just being introduced to the astonishing scope and depth of Luther's thought, and to the advanced student welcoming a convenient check-list (particularly rich in sermon excerpts) in the pursuit of a given topic. In breadth and arrangement, the compilation far outdoes the useful Aland *Luther-lexikon.*

Meanwhile, this anthology fills me with misgivings. One is the expectation that the opus may become for many a sort of intellectual *opus operatum,* a homogenized Luther, and a substitute for reading him in sequence and live context. Old-Missouri's typical topical approach tends to replace the goose that lays the golden eggs with a neatly dissected anatomical display. But honestly, this risk does not bother me unduly, for the compiler has often enough made his excerpts gratifyingly full, and no one *has* to be deterred from turning to Luther's own writings.

What does disappoint me deeply is the slant that Luther receives in the editing. Luther used to accuse the Zwinglians of viewing the Scriptures through a colored glass, so that no matter what color was put before them they always saw the same tint. In "What Luther Says" we have a Luther viewed through rose-colored peepers. Apparently the compiler diligently approached Luther with an open mind expecting to find him thoroughly conformed to Franz Pieper, and was not disappointed. Sometimes in the editing the magnificent, sturdy strength of Missouri comes through most helpfully. But, meanwhile, ideas like verbal inspiration, the Galesburg rule, the centrality of the satisfaction doctrine, and the sharp distinction of justification and sanctification are summarily pinned on Luther and carefully annotated like Roman Catholic Bibles, and thus presented as if they were safely and permanently settled questions both as to dogmatics and as to Luther. (Dogmatically dubious, by the way, is the edifying footnote equation of justification with getting and sanctification with *giving.*)

All this makes me wonder exactly to whom this anthology is directed. Hardly to the "average person" or even the average student if the price of the set is $25.00, unless this is construed as a testimony to the prosperity of modern American piety. Hardly to the advancing student who needs to be sent to study Luther on his own initiative, for the editorial policy bids fair to box him in. In the introduction—a bit of information engulfed in a mass of pure hagiography—we are told that the choice of selection "followed no predetermined pattern other than this, that the passages must present Scripture truths. Fortunately, there is little in the Reformer's writings that does not pass this test"; meanwhile it is claimed that the compiler has "let Luther present himself and speak for himself." The implication is that "thus saith Luther" is a practically perfect guide to "thus saith the Lord." Yet it is acknowledged that little will be chosen from the young Luther, and it is argued that the mature Luther must be considered standard. Secondly, the impression is given that live problems in the interpretation of Luther's thought are practically non-existent; and thirdly, the select bibliography is a sheer pity. Virtually the whole present and past generation of real Luther interpreters might as well never have existed. Few are mentioned, and few of these (Bainton, of all people!) emerge unscathed; Karl Holl receives a three-line notice and a one-line disparagement. They were wasting their time; everything was already there in Franz Pieper, whose "Dogmatics" are labelled "as irrefutable as Scripture itself!"

I can only conclude that this magnificent compilation, whose aim is frankly declared to be "practical," is designed to feed the "pious reader," with the hope that the circle may be large, receptive, and submissive; but considering the dutiful slant of interpretation and the lushness of editorial style, such a reader would be in very truth a purple Pieper eater.

Magnificent the anthology remains, however! I expect to get a lot of use from it. But I shall use Luther's frequent advice to distinguish the kernel from the shell.

ROBERT H. FISHER

Luther in Protestantism Today. By Merle William Boyer. New York: Association Press, 1958. 188 pages. $3.50.

This is a well written book with a good idea. Professor Boyer addresses not exactly the cultured despisers of Protestantism, but rather the "fellow travelers" or "lost adherents" whose true home is with a rightly understood Protestantism and not with Roman Catholicism, Marxism, or naturalistic humanism. He seeks to clarify the true nature of Protestantism, to eliminate false claims, and to show the present relevance of Luther's "religious concerns." "It is this relevancy of the Reformation teachings for our time which we are anxious to bring to the attention of fellow travelers." He is convinced that in this path lie meaningfulness and freedom and purpose for many a thoughtful person still adrift in life.

The title of the book might lead one to expect an analysis of the various forms of Protestantism, and Luther's place therein. Instead, Dr. Boyer is inviting outsiders to examine basic, historic Protestantism, with Luther as the key figure. First he discusses the principles that went into the construction of the "mighty fortress" of Luther's faith. Then he examines the controversies into which this faith led Luther ("The old bitter foe"). Next follow chapters tracing some practical results of Protestantism as it has affected and continues to affect the institutional life of Western civilization: the organized church ("We tremble not, . . ."); education, politics, economics, the family and the common life ("He's by our side . . ."); and, finally, he asks whether there is a genuine Protestant way of life, and in what sense we may affirm that "the Kingdom ours remaineth."

There is much in these chapters, particularly the first and last, to challenge the thoughtful man to think, to lead him into lively discussion, and even to stir him. It is not incompatible with this appreciation to say that I disagree with the author's judgment in dozens of instances historical, theological, and philosophical. For example, I do not believe that the starting point of Luther's theology was the nature of man, or that Luther was a "mystic" in his conception of the Lord's Supper; I disagree with the

enthusiasm for the "young Luther" to the point of disparaging the "old, authoritarian Luther"; I am dubious about Dr. Boyer's suggestion that Renaissance and Reformation should be wedded, and more than dubious about the plea in favor of "idealism" as the best philosophical carrier of the Reformation's religious concerns (I note that the author also is enthusiastic for Kierkegaard, for whom idealism was such a *bete noir*). Actually, one almost never meets Luther first-hand in these pages; the author valiantly tries to summarize him, but I should say that if the book has a weakness it is that it shows so few of the fruits of contemporary Luther research.

But even these disagreements ought not prevent a fruitful, personally engaging discussion from arising out of the book; indeed, they may whet it! For Dr. Boyer is concerned ultimately not so much with Luther as with the Gospel that liberated and guarded and girded and guided Luther; and not so much with an armchair debate as with a challenge that affects one's life and outlook and task in this world.

As I finished the book I tried to put myself in the place of a stirred "fellow traveler." To what would I turn next? I could wish Dr. Boyer had provided some suggestions to send me farther on my way.

ROBERT H. FISHER

The Ten Commandments and Modern Man. By H. G. G. Herklots. Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, Inc., 1958. 190 pages. $2.75.

The author, Canon Herklots, has been vicar of Doncaster, England, since 1951. He has a number of books to his credit, all originally published by Oxford University Press. His books show capable exposition of the Bible, wide reading with many well chosen quotations well documented, and clarity of expression. The chapters in this book were first preached to his people.

The title of the book accurately describes Canon Herklots' purpose. He believes that the Ten Commandments are just as relevant to twentieth century life as when they were given to Moses. They were never a dead code to the Hebrews but evidence of the activity of the living God. They do not confront man with arguments for the existence of God but they proclaim his will. Even nonbelievers accept the laws against murder, adultery, theft, and slander, but the obligation to obey them is different from that of the man of faith. The believer recognizes them as the will of the God who not only created him but is his deliverer.

Disobedience to these laws, the author insists, "depersonalizes man and his society, making them less the man and the society they were intended to be." The commandments are therefore not arbitrary commands, but guides for achieving God's purpose in man and society. Acceptance of a personal God as law-giver is essential for understanding the Ten Commandments. While each command is separately treated, all point back to the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Idolatry is the basic source of disobedience in the twentieth century as in every age.

The author applies the commandments with rare skill to this age. Padding an expense account, he says, is as much a breaking of the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," as shoplifting. Political propaganda is "bearing false witness." Interpretation must be in the light of Christ's teaching. Love fulfills the law but does not revoke it.

AMOS JOHN TRAVER

Concise Dictionary of Judaism. By Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. 237 pages. $5.00.

Designed as "a handy and up-to-date guidebook of quick reference in the fields of Jewish history, religion, philosophy and literature," this small volume fulfills its purpose fairly well. For the person who has no access to larger, more thorough reference works this book will perhaps be useful. Its brief explanations are often intriguing and almost always clearly understandable to the non-Jewish reader.

Occasionally the work is marred by highly dubious explanations such as: Abishag as "last love of king David"; antinomianism as "Christian opposition to Jewish law"; Jerusalem as "city of peace"; lex talionis as "never interpreted literally"; and Shaddai as "Master, Destroyer." Sometimes the lack of balance in the relative amount of space

devoted to individual entries is rather startling. Amos gets thirty-eight lines, while Micah is merely "prophet of a messianic era," and Nahum must be content with the peculiar label "companion prophet to Jonah." Tobit was the only striking omission noted. Sixty-four full-page illustrations, generally of outstanding personalities of Jewish history, constitute one of the book's most pleasant features.

RONALD M. HALS

Philosophy of the Buddha. By A. J. Bahm. New York: Harper & Bros., 1958. 175 pages. $3.00.

Prof. Archie Bahm (University of New Mexico) presents in this book a study of the philosophical views of Gotama Buddha. Bahm's concern is not with the many Buddhist philosophies that stem from the Buddha, but the views of Gotama himself. As a result he has attempted to dig down beneath layers of commentary and gloss in order to arrive at what he believes to be the original views of Gotama. His conclusion is that many views are attributed to Gotama today that simply are not his. He sees the essential message of Gotama to be: "Desire for what will not be attained ends in frustration; therefore, to avoid frustration, avoid desiring what will not be attained." Bahm pursues this principle in the earliest collections of Buddhist writings, the Vinaya and Sutta Pitakas, and cites other Buddhist writings chiefly to show how they deviate from Gotama's views.

He explores why there were such misunderstandings and then carefully spells out the ideas of the Four Truths and the so-called "eight-step path." The essence of Buddha's teaching, Bahm says, is the "middle way," which is not a metaphysical but an ethical principle. Bahm denies that Gotama teaches that one should ultimately seek to extinguish desire—this would be a violation of the middle way, and it is a false understanding of the meaning of Nirvana besides.

Bahm is not an uncritical admirer of the Buddha, and finds him philosophically wanting in four respects: Gotama is not sufficiently realistic, voluntaristic, idealistic, and instrumentalistic.

The work is a good introductory study to original Buddhism. It abounds in quotations from original sources, is very readable, and to this reviewer's estimate, a good account.

WILLIAM H. K. NARUM

The Christ of the Earliest Christians. By William M. Ramsay. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959. 163 pages. $3.00.

The purpose of this book is "to find the very earliest answers" to the question, "What do you think of Christ." In order to answer this question the author proposes to investigate the early sermons recorded in Acts, sermons by Peter, Stephen, and Paul. The assumption is that since Luke the historian records these sermons as preached during the very earliest days of the church, they represent the earliest witness that we have to the Christian proclamation of the Gospel and to the person of Christ. To substantiate this assumption the author examines the trustworthiness of Luke as a historian by comparing his accounts with the archaeological evidence and with facts from the letters of Paul. He also considers evidence that Luke used sources which go back "to the very cradle of Christianity, to Jerusalem itself." The sermons themselves bear the character of an early witness. The conclusion is that, as Luke has reported them, the sermons do reflect the thought of the earliest church.

In these early sermons there are five great assertions made about Jesus. He is Messiah, Fulfiller of the Old Testament, Man on Earth, the Risen and Exalted One, and a Living and Present Power. Stephen in his sermon, or defense, adds the idea of Jesus as the universal Lord of Christian Mission, and in Paul's sermon in Antioch Jesus is called the Son of God. In a brief survey of the writings of Revelation, Paul, Hebrews, and John the author finds the same fundamental ideas as those presented in the early sermons, although the emphases become different and the ideas are further developed.

The arguments of the author are presented in a positive and lucid manner. Even though the documents of the New Testament were written relatively late, it is quite clear that the tradition preserves the earliest proclama-

tion about Jesus. There is really no evidence or trace of a Christian message which did not have as its central point the confession of Jesus Christ as Lord. The author admits that this historical investigation, no matter how far back it is carried, cannot establish the truth of the Gospel, but it is perhaps inevitable that the presentation nevertheless suggests this idea. The statement is even made that "the first sermons in Acts help prove the Resurrection." This is of course an overstatement, since all that can be proved is that the early disciples believed and proclaimed this event. The author makes a strong case, however, for his thesis that the earliest Christian message was a confession of Jesus Christ as Lord and Son of God.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

I Believe in Jesus Christ. By Walter Russell Bowie. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959. 80 pages. $1.25.

This little volume by the well known preacher and professor of Homiletics is one in the "Know Your Faith" Series. These volumes are intended as an inspirational discussion of important areas of the Christian faith "in simple, nontechnical language to help answer every person's questions about his beliefs and to aid in strengthening his faith."

Starting with the Jesus of the Gospel of Mark and working his way to "Christ in our present world," the author seeks to impress upon the mind and heart of the reader the tremendous figure of him who marched from tragedy to triumph. Among the abundant illustrative material there is a solid outline of the story of the Christ who lived and died and rose again to rule in power, the power of love. Yet to one in whose Christian faith and life forgiveness of sins is central, with every thought and movement of life having its beginning as well as its place of refuge there, the total impression of the book seems to be either on the weak side, or simply on the side.

For one who already can say, "I believe in Jesus Christ," this is a useful little book. Perhaps even for those who cannot it will perform a service.

WALTER J. KUKKONEN

A Shorter Commentary on Romans. By Karl Barth. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959. 188 pages. $3.00.

This commentary is "a smaller and younger" brother of the commentary on Romans by K. Barth published in 1918 and 1921. The author points out in the preface that the present work is a new interpretation, not an extract or an abbreviation of the former. There are naturally some differences between this work and the previous one, but Barth's fundamental position is the same. This volume is an example of how a philosophical theologian deals with the biblical material on the basis of his own system of thought. Thus we meet again the arguments against any "natural" knowledge of God, and that the Gospel itself is God's law (p. 41). Barth also says that "our relationship to God is one of law, regulated by Jesus Christ" (p. 46).

Everyone would certainly be interested in hearing what Barth has to say about Romans now after forty years of further study and meditation since the first commentary was published. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the language of the book is such that it is both difficult and painful to read. At least half of the sentences are long and involved, some extending to ten or twelve lines. Many of the sentences are so chopped up with parenthetical remarks that the reader has to go back and assemble the various phrases before the meaning becomes clear. Maybe we are supposed to read with patience and concentration, but in that case we would prefer to read Paul rather than Barth. The language is not only involved, it is careless and unclear. Some of this may be due to the translation, as, for example, "Are not right they, are they not consistent . . ." (p. 40), and, "In the reflected shine (?) of the fire of wrath . . ." (p. 28). But the obscurity is due to the original as much as to the translation.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

The Meaning of Baptism. By John Frederick Jansen. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958. 125 pages. $2.50.

This little book by the professor of Religion at Hanover College in Indiana consists of twenty-one meditations on the meaning

and relevance of Baptism. They reflect the excellent studies of P. T. Forsyth and Oscar Cullmann from which the author quotes generously and faithfully. His aim throughout the book is to revive interest in and consolation from the sacrament, which in some sectors of Protestantism has become merely "a meaningless social custom." His essays abound in quotations from the Scriptures and the hymns of the church. The theology cannot be classified as Calvinistic or Lutheran, but is definitely the theology of the church and the Scriptures on the sacrament of Baptism. This book will stimulate the reading clergyman to preach on Baptism and will point any Christian who reads it to a better understanding of this sacrament and its role in the life of the church. Jansen's emphasis in each chapter rests on that which God accomplishes in and through this sacrament and how this divine power effects and sustains the life with God in Christ.

EDWARD C. FENDT

The Twelve Speak. By Derward William Deere. New York: The American Press, 1958. 164 pages. $2.95.

This is volume one of "a new translation of the minor prophets" which includes also brief interpretative footnotes and an introduction to the prophetic office, mission, and message. The translation is not greatly different from the standard versions but does offer some fine insights. For example, in Amos 6:12, "Can horses gallop on a cliff? Or the sea be ploughed by oxen?" and also in Hosea 11:9, "I will not go to the limit of fierceness of My anger; I will not completely destroy Ephraim." The interpretative comments are generally helpful in bringing out the religious relevance of the prophet's words, though in some cases one may question whether the understanding of a verse is in harmony with the context. Such seems to be the case in Hosea 6:1-3, which is interpreted eschatologically; and in Hosea 13:14, where the author rejects the question form of RSV and interprets as a promise of deliverance from Sheol, whereas the context is one of judgment: "Repentance shall be hid from My eyes." The introductory section, which restates old truths in a fresh way, is very helpful and readable. The book makes no attempt to deal with critical problems of the text. It can be read with profit by Bible students who are unfamiliar with the language in which the prophets spoke and wrote. The six prophets included in the book are Obadiah, Joel, Jonah, Amos, Hosea, and Micah.

J. P. MILTON

The Temple of Jerusalem. By Andre Parrot. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 112 pages. $2.75.

Samaria: The Capital of the Kingdom of Israel. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. 143 pages. $2.75.

Babylon and the Old Testament. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. 166 pages.

To the serious Bible student concerned about finding authentic background material to illuminate the Scriptures, there is no finer series of monographs than the "Studies in Biblical Archaeology," which have been appearing in rather rapid succession since 1955 under the editorship of the astute curator-in-chief of the French National Museums, André Parrot, who is also professor at the École du Louvre in Paris and was director of the famous Mari Archaeological Expedition. The three volumes herein discussed are all by the learned professor himself and are based on original French editions.

The Temple of Jerusalem (No. 5 in the series), translated by B. E. Hooke from the second edition of *Ninive et l'Ancien Testament* (1955), describes the various temples that have been built in Jerusalem from the time of Solomon to the present Moslem shrines in the Haram al-Sherif. A greater portion of the monograph is devoted to Solomon's famous temple, its history, architectural plan, decorative features, and sacrificial objects. Latest archaeological data uncovered especially in excavations of Phoenician temples have been drawn upon to illustrate the text. Brief chapters are also devoted to Ezekiel's vision of the temple (Ezek. 40-44) and the second temple completed shortly after the Exile under Joshua and Zerubbabel, and Herod's temple. Ezekiel's temple was never completed but exercised a great influence, according to Parrot, on the grandiose plan of Herod's temple. The illustrations provide a vivid

picture of the temple which was standing in Jesus' day and was destroyed by the Romans in A.D. 70. In a final chapter on the temple area of east Jerusalem a brief account is given of the successive stages in the history of this holy place, sacred to Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. A fine plan is included which shows the location of the present Moslem shrines: the Dome of the Rock, the Dome of the Chain, and the Aqsa Mosque.

The Monograph on Samaria (No. 7 in the series), translated by S. H. Hooke from the French *Samarie Capitale du Royaume d'Israël* (1955), provides an excellent companion to the one on the temples of Jerusalem, for it presents a thorough historical survey of this rival capital of Jerusalem from the time of its founding in the early ninth century B.C. to the Christian era. After reading this fascinating account one realizes the importance of this city which though mentioned only a few times in the Bible played a leading role in religion and history. Chapters are devoted to an account of Samaria's role in the history of the Northern Kingdom, modern archaeological excavations at Samaria, Samaria's history under Assyrian, Babylonian, Hellenistic, and Roman domination. A final chapter is devoted to Samaria and John the Baptist, who according to tradition was buried within its walls. The twelve plates of well chosen pictures and the thirty-three figures which include many maps and line drawings depicting architectural details of the walls, artefacts, and Assyrian conquerors add much to the vividness of the account. A helpful chronological table from the time of Israel's first king Jeroboam I (922 B.C.) to the Roman emperor Alexander Severus (A.D. 222) lists in comparative columns important events and rulers in the countries whose history affected Samaria.

The monograph on Babylon, translated by B. H. Hooke from the French *Babylone et l'Ancien Testament* (1956), is divided into two long chapters, the first of which recounts the impressive story of Babylonian archaeology, the second the history and civilization of the mighty empire which brought to an end the kingdom of Judah. The chapter on exploration traces in detail the sites of the many important palaces, citadels, temples, and streets uncovered during the eighteen continuous years of excavations by Germans (1899-1917). The chapter on history and civilization utilizes the rich fund of written records found in archaeological excavations of the past century and relates their account to the Old Testament record of the relations between Babylon, Israel, and Judah. The account begins with Hammurabi, founder of the first dynasty in the 18th century B.C. and concludes with Cyrus the Great, who brought to an end the independence of Babylon in the latter 6th century B.C. The beautiful photographs of the excavated buildings, the figures depicting art and architecture, religious life, historical events, as well as the fine maps and temple and palace plans again add much to the value of this little volume. Chronological and synoptic tables give a comparative account of the history of Babylon from its founding in the 25th century B.C. to its end as an independent power.

All three monographs under consideration contain helpful select bibliographies of general works as well as books and articles on pertinent excavation, history, and geography of the sites under discussion. It is to be regretted that indices of names and subjects as well as Bible references were not included in each volume. This would have added to the usefulness of these excellent studies.

ROBERT H. BOYD

God in Us. By Miles Lowell Yates. Edited by W. Norman Pittenger and William H. Ralston, Jr. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1959. 206 pages. $4.25.

When Miles Lowell Yates, an Episcopalian priest and scholar, died unexpectedly in 1956, he left behind him a collection of lectures, sermons, addresses, and meditations. Among these papers was an almost complete manuscript of the lectures he had given to students in the General Seminary in a course entitled "Ascetical Theology." These lectures, together with appended devotional material from Yates's other writings, are presented here under the editorship of two of his colleagues.

Ascetical theology, to Yates, is not a special kind of theology but rather the application of familiar theological data—dogmatic,

moral, and evidential—to the spiritual life. He uses *askesis* in the broad sense of the theory and practice of Christian devotion. Thus he describes this work as "a series of considerations on the spiritual life, the inner life, in the light of the records of what great souls have been like and what they have disclosed about our relations to God." The reader soon becomes aware that the author himself has a place among the "great souls." The vitality and sincerity of his presentation bear witness to a rich spirituality which has not only been thought through but also lived out. One who did not have the privilege of knowing the author personally learns from these pages to appreciate the high tribute paid him by the editors: "Among the modern saints Miles Yates was the one dearest to many, the one who taught us what it means to be a Christian man, the one who in his own life embodied that loveliness which belongs to those whose very being is 'hid with Christ in God.'"

The author begins with an analysis of the spiritual commitment, which he conceives as "our dedicated, all-round enterprise for furthering a unitive relationship with God." The success of the enterprise depends on three factors: faith, by which the soul realizes God; the will-union, by which the soul responds to God; and grace, by which the soul finds reinforcement in communion with God. Starting from these fundamentals we must "mount the ladder of commitment to God rung by rung." The principal transitions are from self to Creator, from subject to Sovereign, and from sinner to Redeemer.

The latter half of the book consists of chapters on penitence, the eucharistic offering, adoration, mental prayer, prayer of petition, self-discipline, and charity. A pithy epigram sums up Christian *askesis*: "A heart of fire toward God; a heart of flesh toward men; a heart of steel toward self."

As empirical analysis of the spiritual life and as stimulus to devotional exercise this book is commendable. The same cannot be said, however, about the theology upon which it rests. I have placed question marks opposite almost every statement made about grace. "We move, *by* faith, *through* the prayerful act of will-union, *into* grace." Grace is "a reinforcement of all that is best in us." "Grace itself is the eternally promised reward." Although Yates seeks to espouse God-centered religion, his conception of divine grace as the reinforcement or goal of man's spiritual effort leads him to emphasize man's way to God rather than God's way to man. This becomes especially clear in his discussion of the Eucharist. "We set our own imperfect and penitent wills to be sanctified —offering them, presenting ourselves, again and again to God." "Our giving in Christ has its issue in our receiving from Christ. Lifting up our hearts to bless God, we are blessed." "Here pre-eminently is what *we* come to *do;* and in our communion God *does* the rest, accepting our praise and purpose, saying his own strengthening 'Yes' to it." It is precisely the danger of slipping into this kind of theology that has led many Lutheran theologians to be wary of the use of the eucharistic prayer contained in our new Service Book.

A mature evangelical Christian may well enrich his devotional life by appropriating much of the practical wisdom and spiritual insight in which this book abounds. But his *askesis* will sound much more clearly this keynote: the basis of *Deus in nobis* is *Christus pro nobis.*

T. A. KANTONEN

The World Is Learning Compassion. By Frank C. Laubach. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1958. 251 pages. $3.50.

Is it accident of history that the scientific, technological, and medical achievements that have done so much to improve man's existence on this planet are the products of Western culture? Can these developments be attributed to climate or to racial superiority? While there is no simple explanation of this problem, I believe that a state of mind or a working faith developed in Europe and the Americas which moved men to work for the improvement of life on earth and that this faith is a by-product of the Gospel. Jesus awakened compassion, an active concern for people inspired by faith in the worth of our earthly existence. That life on earth is worth living, that men should devote themselves to the service of their neighbors, that there are orderly processes in the universe which, if understood and obeyed, can bring blessing to man, that God

has delivered us from evil, sin, and death so that we are free to devote ourselves to improving the lot of all men on earth—this is the working faith that does much to explain the breath-taking progress in the organization and improvement of our existence on earth.

Dr. Frank C. Laubach, famed for his own work of compassion in bringing ability to read to illiterate millions through his "each one teach one" program, has given us in this book an impressive body of evidence that lends support to the thesis that modern miracles of medicine and science are contingent upon the slow, quiet growth of compassion nurtured for centuries in the Christian community. The purpose of the book is to show that this compassion has burst out into the secular realm and is well on the way to becoming the creed and practice of the world.

He traces the growth of compassion through the centuries as men, inspired by Christ's example of compassionate service, struggled against man's inhumanity to man. He shows how the horribly brutal forms of amusement in the Roman circuses died away under the expanding influence of the church; how the church pioneered in taking care of the sick, of prisoners and pilgrims; how missionaries struggled to bring about a new attitude toward women wherever they went (it was the custom in India to bury widows alive with their husbands until William Carey came and fought against it); how such groups as the Quakers have opposed war until now everyone has an uneasy conscience about it; how missionaries opposed the slave traffic; how such persons as John Wesley fought against the exploitation of the poor; how John Frederick Oberlin introduced scientific agriculture and a comprehensive social program to transform his community; how a man named Henry Bergh helped found the world's first Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (as late as 1875!) when he discovered that there was no law to prevent a little girl he knew from being beaten by her parents; and there are many other instances cited. Laubach has impressive chapters on modern missions (which have pioneered in technological assistance in underdeveloped countries), medical missions, the literacy program, and movements to bring justice to "the common man."

The story of achievements in what he calls "the incredible twentieth century" takes up two-thirds of the book. Laubach describes how through unions and legislation the economic conditions of the laboring class have been improved; he tells the story of Herbert Hoover's pioneering work in post-war relief; he reports that private philanthropy has increased from seven foundations in the nineteenth century to over seven thousand today. Particularly interesting is the varied program of the Rockefeller Foundation. He tells about the various international programs connected with the United Nations, the Point Four program of our government, such relief programs as CARE, CROP, and AWAKE; and he has a chapter on the achievements of cooperative movements throughout the world. I must confess that there is such an exciting profusion of information about what is actually being done that I felt a bit overwhelmed by the weight of evidence gathered to support the belief that the compassion of Jesus has become or is becoming a world-wide creed. This story needed to be told in a century during which the headlines have been given to acts of almost unbelievable cruelty and brutality and to the constant threats of annihilation that are implicitly in the cold war.

It would be easy for us to forget the fact that the Christian community has been the pioneer in many efforts to improve man's lot on earth now that far more humanitarian programs are going on outside the church than within it. It would not only be easy but it would be fatal, because the humanitarianism of our time is a sign of the fact that the Christian faith has profoundly influenced our culture and still has a great impact even upon people who have given up that faith as a personal credo. If that faith dies, it is likely that the humanitarian programs will wither. Christians can rejoice wherever the works of compassion are done even if by those outside the church, but they must not relax their efforts to preach the Gospel everywhere to all men lest the faith which sustains love should die.

This book should be within the reach of

everyone who needs documentation for the amazing story of the spreading results of good will among men.

ROBERT L. ESBJORNSON

One Way of Living. By George M. Docherty. New York: Harpers, 1958. 173 pages. $3.00.

This book of sermons by the pastor who succeeded Peter Marshall at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington purports to present an interpretation of Christianity somewhere between the extremes represented by Billy Graham and Reinhold Niebuhr. I was intrigued by this bold claim and attacked the book with interest to see whether or not the author was able to live up to his purpose.

I would say that Dr. Docherty has more of an awareness of the subtleties—both psychological and theological—of the Christian faith and experience than does Billy Graham. He is aware that not all problems are solved by having made a decision to live for Christ and that this business of living the Christian life in a modern, complicated world is not at all simple. However, he seems to be much more interested in the personal relationship of man to God than he is in the ethical problems of the Christian and the problems of corporate justice. All but two of the sermons deal with the personal religious life. This may be as it should be, but it indicates that Docherty leans much more toward Billy Graham than toward Reinhold Niebuhr, not in style but in basic concerns. His two sermons, "Piety and Politics" and "This Nation Under God," are excellent and an indication of this man's ability to sound the prophetic note should he choose to do so. The latter is a sermon that did much to inspire Congress to change the pledge of allegiance to the flag so that it would contain the phrase "under God." It contains an excellent answer to those who object that the phrase forces agnostics and atheists to make a pledge contrary to their convictions. Docherty observes that the pledge is to the flag, not to a belief in God; and that the flag is the symbol of a nation that exists not merely in unity, indivisibility, and liberty but through its founders and laws and culture, because its people believe in the existence of God. In other words, the United States, as a matter of historical fact, exists because of people believing in God, among other true realities.

Docherty has a refreshingly personal and poetic style of preaching that seems to be the trait of many Scottish divines. He is not afraid to use personal experience to illuminate his trend of thought, but his manner of using such material is not at all offensive. The first sermon in the book is the recollection of his own call into the Christian ministry and a personal witness. When I describe his style as poetic I do not mean that he uses poetry well or that he has a facile way of playing with words for effect. He has a gift of creating images and describing scenes and telling stories that makes his sermons very compelling; one's feelings as well as one's intellect respond to the message. Good preaching that goes beyond sound exegesis to a compelling style of presentation that reaches out to persuade the hearer or reader to make a decision is well illustrated in this book. It is no accident that the great prophets of Israel were also great poets. The ability to translate theological truth into the concrete imagery of a language drawn from life is a necessary qualification or at least skill that needs to be developed for good preaching. One of Docherty's sermons, "If You Will," illustrates very well his ability to use analogy. He tells the story of Bill, an alcoholic who would not respond to any treatment or influences that sought to help him, including Docherty's and that of Alcoholics Anonymous. But the author relates the story not to condemn alcoholism but to illustrate the fact that no one, not even God, can *compel* a man to respond to grace. "What *do you will* that I do unto you?" Christ asks. Just as Bill and Bill alone could say No to a drink, so it is with each man. Only he can say Yes to God, no matter how many influences and persons there are to encourage him along the way.

Read this book if you want to see how language can be used to stir the heart and convince the mind. It is a lesson in good preaching style, and for good measure running over a "good meal" for the spirit.

ROBERT L. ESBJORNSON

Luther's Works. Vol. 40: Church and Ministry, II. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958. 410 pages. $5.00.

The individual volumes of this series certainly need no added promotion. Like its predecessors, this volume leaves all who would be more adequately informed concerning Luther deeply indebted to the editors and the translators. Inasmuch as two areas of major confusion in Lutheran theology are the doctrines of the church and the ministry, this volume is particularly welcome.

Included in this volume are several of Luther's writings concerning those who perpetrated the flank attack against Luther, namely the "spiritual enthusiasts." One of the most valuable of these treatises is the one directed "Against the Heavenly Prophets in the Matter of Images and Sacraments," of 1525. Thorough study of this treatise will provide a telling antidote to the Barthian notion that "our relationship to God is one of law, regulated by Jesus Christ." (See *A Shorter Commentary on Romans,* 1959, p. 46.) Against Dr. Karlstadt Luther declares: "Dr. Karlstadt's theology has not gotten beyond teaching how we are to imitate Christ, making Christ only an example and lawgiver. From this only works can be learned. He does not know and teach Christ as our treasure and the gift of God, from which faith follows, and which is the highest of all doctrines" (p. 207). Again Luther states this same view most emphatically: "We are of the opinion that it is not necessary to do or refrain from doing all that Christ has done or refrained from doing. Otherwise we would also have to walk on the sea, and do all the miracles that he has done. Furthermore, we would have to refrain from marriage, abandon temporal authority, forsake field and plow, and all that he has refrained from doing . . ." (p. 132).

Lutherans who have been disturbed by our confessional emphasis upon the "power of the keys" will be both pleased and strengthened by the clear treatise on "The Keys." Here the differences between our beliefs and those of Rome are clearly delineated, and the legitimate exercise of the power of the keys is bound to the Gospel and to him who is the Word of God. When the pastor exercises the authority of his office to proclaim the Word of God (always both Law and Gospel) he is in fact exercising the power of the keys. Luther identifies Christ with his proclamations in this manner (Christ is speaking): "It shall be one single action, mine and yours, not a twofold one. It shall be one and the same key, mine and yours, not a twofold one. While you do your work, mine is already done. When you bind and loose, I have already bound and loosed . . . [Thus Christ] binds and joins himself to our work" (p. 365).

It is the hope of this reviewer, as obviously also of the editors and translators, that this volume will serve as a valuable resource to the Lutheran Church as it rethinks the meaning of God's divinely appointed means of grace administered in and by his church in our day.

ARNOLD E. CARLSON

The Cultural Significance of the Reformation. By Karl Holl. Translated by Karl and Barbara Hertz and John H. Lichtblau. New York: Living Age Books (Meridian), 1959). Paper, 191 pages. $1.25.

Although it is a pity that this essay, in its revised form about forty years old, was not translated into English earlier, we can only be grateful that it is available now. In the excellent introduction which he prepared for this translation, Professor Wilhelm Pauck explains the circumstances out of which the essay grew: over against the economic determinism of Karl Marx and the *Kulturprotestantismus* of Ernst Troeltsch, the author believed that it was possible to demonstrate the lasting influence of the Reformation in shaping Western culture. He proceeded to trace this influence in political and economic life, on education, history, philosophy, poetry, and art. Holl concluded with the confident assertion that "the Reformation is not at the end, but only at the beginning of its world-wide effect."

While in this brief and readable essay Holl may not be entirely convincing on every point he tries to make, for the evidence is sometimes more ambiguous than he suggests, the cumulative effect of his argument is impressive. The translation is well done.

Luthers Werke in Auswahl. Edited by Otto Clemen. Fifth revised edition of Volumes I-IV. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1959. 512, 464, 516, 428 pages.

Now that many of Luther's works are being translated into English and are thus made accessible to more readers, attention deserves to be called to a new edition of the first four volumes of Clemen's standard "Luther." Intended by Otto Clemen, distinguished authority of a generation ago, to give serious students easy access to basic works of Luther in their original German and Latin texts, this uncommonly rich and well chosen selection was first published in 1912 and has since been reprinted three times.

The present revision, prepared by Professor Kurt Aland, is a good offset reproduction of the earlier texts in which a few changes have been skillfully introduced. These changes consist for the most part in the substitution (in introductions, margins, and footnotes) of references to the Weimar edition for former references to the Erlangen edition of Luther's works. Only a very few corrections were made in the texts themselves. Aland has also added to the front of the first volume some tables which show what parts of the Weimar edition are reproduced in Clemen.

The importance of reading Luther in the original texts cannot be overemphasized, and it is to be hoped that this excellent and inexpensive (about $2.50 a volume) edition will be used in North America. The texts are of great value not only for students of sixteenth century German and Latin, but also for students of the history and theology of the Reformation. Clemen was successful in his effort to include a selection of Luther's works which might set out and illustrate all aspects of the Reformer's activity and thought. The four volumes which have now been revised reproduce, in chronological order, selected writings of Luther from 1517 to 1545. The remaining four supplementary volumes, still in print but not now revised, include letters, table talks, sermons, and commentaries.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

History of Methodist Missions. Vol. III, The Methodist Episcopal Church: Widening Horizons. By Wade Crawford Barclay. New York: Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, 1957. 1,211 pages. $4.50.

The first of a projected six-volume history of "American Methodism in its character as a Christian missionary movement," subsidized by the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, appeared in 1949. The present or third volume, treating the period from 1845 to 1895, covers the activity only of northern Methodists (Vol. V is to deal with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South). The intention to describe Methodist home, foreign, and social missions in a "comprehensive, detailed, and accurate" fashion is fulfilled, as the very scale of the undertaking might suggest.

More than ordinary attention is given to a description of the changing American scene in which Methodists found themselves. Immigration, industrialization, and urbanization are among the significant factors touched upon. Meanwhile changes were going on in the church itself: itineracy was reduced, the laity gained influence, discipline declined, theology broadened. The church also addressed itself to its environment and became involved in slavery and temperance issues, in matters affecting labor, morals, and amusements.

In 1844 Methodists centralized their missionary efforts, and shortly after this what had been quite exclusively a program for domestic missions became a program for foreign missions as well. A succession of able administrators, aided by large increases in financial support, made notable missionary advances possible. As in other communions, so among Methodists, women were very active in their support of work at home and abroad.

Missionaries moved westward with the geographical expansion of the United States. New churches were established in rapid succession in new settlements. New work was also begun in older towns and cities: special ministries to seamen in port towns, to the destitute and unemployed victims of industrialization, to the unchurched. In addi-

tion to work among American Indians, attention was paid to new immigrants—Welshmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Scandinavians, Italians, Chinese, Japanese, etc.

The greater part of the volume is devoted to foreign missions in China, India, Malaysia, Japan, Korea, Central and South America, Africa, and Europe. Lutherans will find especially interesting the good account of Methodist missionary efforts in predominantly Lutheran lands. Ole Peter Petersen introduced the Methodist Church to Norway from America (1849), Boie Smith was the first Methodist to preach in Denmark (1857), John Peter Larsson began work in Sweden (1852), Gustaf Lervik in Finland (1859), Ludwig Jacoby in Germany (1849). Methodists also entered Switzerland, Bulgaria, and Italy.

This impressive and far-ranging volume, well written and heavily documented, helps to an understanding not only of Methodist missions but also of the character of American Christianity as a whole.